BHAVAN'S BOOK UNIVERSITY

THE HISTORY AND CULTURE
OF THE
INDIAN PEOPLE

★

BRITISH PARAMOUNTCY AND INDIAN RENAISSANCE

PART II

★

BHARATIYA VIDYA BHAVAN
MUMBAI

Agartala * Agra * Ahmedabad * Allahabad * Amritsar * Andheri * Aurangabad
Bagalkot * Bangalore * Baroda * Belgaum * Bellary * Bharuch * Bharwari
Bhatpara * Bhimavaram * Bhopal * Bhubaneshwar * Bhusawal * Chandigarh
Chatrapur (Bhatti Mines) * Chennai * Coimbatore * Dakor * Dehradun * Guntur
Guruvayur * Guwahati * Haldia * Hazira * Hosur * Hubli-Dharwad * Hyderabad
Indore * Irinjalakuda * Jabalpur * Jaipur * Jalgaon * Jammu Tawi * Jamnagar
Jodhpur * Kakinada * Kammam * Kanchipuram * Kannur * Kanpur * Khor * Kochi
Kodagu * Kodaikanal * Kodinar * Kodungallur * Kolhapur * Kolkata * Kollam
Korba * Kosamba * Kota * Kottayam * Kozhikode * Kurkunta * Kutch * Lucknow
Machilipatnam * Madurai * Malkhed * Mangalore * Mankapur * Modipuram
Mukundgarh * MUMBAI H.O. * Mysore * Nadiad * Nagercoil * Nagpur * Nasik
Noida * Navi Mumbai * New Delhi * Ottappalam * Palakkad * Panchkula * Patna
Ponnani * Pune * Puthucode * Raipur * Ramachandrapuram * Ramanattukara
Ratangarh * Reddipalayam * Renukoot * Roorkee * Rourkela * Salav * Satna
Secunderabad * Serampore * Shimoga * Siliguri * Suchindram * Surat
Tadepalligudam * Thaliparamba * Thirunavaya * Thiruvananthapuram * Thrissur
Tirupati * Udipi-Manipal * Ujjain * Valanchery * Varanasi * Visakhapatnam
Wadakkancherry * Wardha * Wayanad : **Overseas Centres** * London * New York
Toronto * Mexico City Lisbon * Durban * Sydney * Singapore.

The ninth volume of this series deals with the political history and economic condition of India from A.D. 1818 to 1905. This, the tenth volume, deals with the other important aspects of the history of the Indian people during the same period, laying special emphasis on the Renaissance in the 19th century which has transformed India from a Medieval to a Modern country. It begins with a short account of the general condition of the Indian people at the beginning of the 19th century and then proceeds to show how English education was gradually introduced into India in spite of the opposition of early British rulers. It then describes the great impact of English education and the Western ideas, transmitted by it, upon almost all important aspects of Indian life. The momentous results of this impact on religious and social ideas, the growth of modern Indian literatures and the rise and development of the Indian Press are described in detail. It then traces how these changes led to the growth of political ideas and political organizations and the birth of patriotism and nationalism. This leads to the discussion of the somewhat complicated questions of the social and political relations between the Indians and the British on the one hand and that between the Hindus and Muslims on the other. A detailed critical study of the Indian and Muslim political ideas and organizations, on separate lines, culminating in the Indian National Congress on the one hand and the Muslim League on the other, is a special feature of the book, as it seeks to remove many current but erroneous views on the subject. Another special feature of this volume is the detailed account of the coolies in the tea-gardens in Assam and the indentured Indian labourers in the British Colonies whose lot was hardly better than that of the serfs or slaves whom they replaced. Indian History, even the comprehensive *Cambridge History of India,* has so far either ignored these topics or dealt with only a few of them and that also in the most casual way. This volume deals with the history of the Indian people and of the great movements and personalities in India during the nineteenth century in a manner such as has not been attempted in any previous history of India.

The writers of this volume include, besides the Editor Dr. R. C. Majumdar, Dr. K. M. Munshi, Dr. K. K. Datta, Dr. M. Wahid Mirza, Dr. S. K. Chatterjee, Sri K. P. Kulkarni, Dr. S. V. Joga Rao, Sri S. Srikantha Sastri, Sri. T. K. Parameswaran Nair, Dr. K. R. Srinivasa Iyengar, and Sri V. N. Datta.

Rs. 500/-

आ नो भद्राः क्रतवो यन्तु विश्वतः
Let noble thoughts come to us from every side

—Rigveda, I-89-i

BHAVAN'S BOOK UNIVERSITY

THE HISTORY AND CULTURE OF THE INDIAN PEOPLE
VOLUME X

BRITISH PARAMOUNTCY
AND
INDIAN RENAISSANCE

PART II

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2018 with funding from
Public.Resource.Org

https://archive.org/details/britishparamount10bhar

BHAVAN'S BOOK UNIVERSITY

The History and Culture of the Indian People
Volume X

BRITISH PARAMOUNTCY AND INDIAN RENAISSANCE

PART II

GENERAL EDITOR
R. C. MAJUMDAR, M.A., PH.D.,

Vice-President of International Commission for a History of the Scientific and Cultural Development of Mankind set up by UNESCO; Honorary Fellow of the Asiatic Society, Calcutta; Honarary Fellow of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland; Honorary Fellow of the Asiatic Society of Bombay;

Hon. Head of the Department of History, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay;

Formerly Vice-Chancellor, University of Dacca, Principal, College of Indology, Hindu University, Banaras, and Visiting Professor of Indian History, Universities of Chicago and Pennsylvania (U.S.A.)

ASSISTANT EDITORS
A. K. MAJUMDAR, M.A., D. PHIL.,
Joint Director, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay

AND

D. K. GHOSE, M.A., D. PHIL., PH.D. (London)
Reader in History, Burdwan University

2007
BHARATIYA VIDYA BHAVAN
Kulapati K. M. Munshi Marg
Mumbai-400 007

All Rights reserved by the Publishers

© Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan
Kulapati K. M. Munshi Marg, Mumbai - 400 007

1st Edition : 1965
2nd Edition : 1981
3rd Edition : 1991
4th Edition : 2007

Price Rs. 500.00

PRINTED IN INDIA
By Atul Goradia at Siddhi Printers, 13/14, Bhabha Building, 13th Khetwadi Lane,
Mumbai - 400 004, and Published by P. V. Sankarankutty Dy. Registrar (Publications),
for Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Kulapati Munshi Marg, Mumbai - 400 007.
E-Mail : brbhavan@bom7.vsnl.net.in • Web-site : www.bhavans.info

CONTRIBUTORS

K. M. MUNSHI
B.A., LL.B., D.LITT.
President, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan

R. C. MAJUMDAR
M.A., PH.D., F.A.S., F.A.S.B., F.R.A.S. (HONY.)

K. K. DATTA
Vice-Chancellor, Magadh University

M. WAHID MIRZA
M.A., PH.D.
Professor and Head of the Department of Arabic,
Lucknow University (Retired)

S. K. CHATTERJI
M.A., D.LITT.
President, Bengal Legislative Council and
Professor Emeritus, University of Calcutta

K. P. KULKARNI
J.P., M.A., B.T.
(Late) *Head of the Marathi Department, Elphinstone College, Bombay*
and Chairman of the Maharashtra State Language Advisory Board

S. V. JOGA RAO
M.A., PH.D.
Lecturer, Andhra University

S. SRIKANTHA SASTRI
Professor of History, Mysore University (Retired)

P. K. PARAMESWARAN NAIR
Supervisor, Malayalam Lexicon, University of Kerala

K. R. SRINIVASA IYENGAR
M.A., D.LITT.
Professor and Head of the Department of
English, Andhra University

V. N. DATTA
M.A., LL.B., M.LITT. (CANTAB)
Reader in History, Kurukshetra University

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I (XXXIX)*

Page

THE INDIAN PEOPLE AT THE BEGINNING OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY 1

By R. C. Majumdar, M.A., Ph.D., F.A.S., F.A.S.B., F.R.A.S. (Hony).

CHAPTER II (XL)

ENGLISH EDUCATION

By R. C. Majumdar, K. K. Datta, M.A., Ph.D.,
Vice-Chancellor, Magadh University.
And V. N. Datta, M.A., LL.B., M. Litt. (Cantab).
Reader in History, Kurukshetra University.

I. Beginnings of English Education in Bengal up to 1835 31
II. Aims and objects of English Education 34
III. British policy towards Education up to 1835 .. 42
IV. General policy and progress of English Education (1835-57) 48
V. General policy and progress of English Education (1858-1905) 52
VI. Vernacular and Primary Education 60
VII. Female Education 65
VIII Progress of Education in different Provinces .. 67
  1. Bengal 67
  2. Bombay 70
  3. Madras 72
  4. Uttar Pradesh 74
  5. The Punjab 77
  6. Chiefs' Colleges 78
IX. Muslim Education 79

Appendix

Controversy between the "Orientalists" and "Anglicists" and Macaulay's Minute on the same .. 81

CHAPTER III (XLI)

IMPACT OF WESTERN CULTURE .. 89

By R. C. Majumdar

---

*The figures within brackets indicate the serial number of Chapters in continuation of those in the preceding volume (Vol. IX).

CHAPTER IV (XLII)

NEW RELIGIOUS IDEAS

By R. C. MAJUMDAR

SECTION VIII By PROF. M. WAHID MIRZA, M.A., PH.D.
Professor and Head of the Department of Arabic, Lucknow University

Page
I. The Brahma Samaj 97
  1. Rammohan Roy 97
  2. Devendra-nath Tagore 101
  3. Keshab-chandra Sen 102
II. The Prarthana Samaj 106
III. The Arya Samaj 107
  1. Dayananda Sarasvati 107
  2. The Arya Samaj 110
  3 The great split 111
IV. Neo-Hinduism 115
V. Ramakrishna Math and Mission 116
  1. Ramakrishna Paramahamsa 116
  2. Svami Vivekananda 123
VI. Theosophical Society 131
VII. Minor Religious Movements 134
VIII. Muslim Religion & Society 140
IX. Christianity 150

CHAPTER V (XLIII)

LITERATURE

I. Introduction by R. C. Majumdar 160
  1. Languages 160
  2. General Survey of the Character of the Literatures in Modern Indian Languages 162
II. Sanskrit—by R. C. Majumdar 163
III. Bengali—by R. C. Majumdar. 166
  1. Growth of Bengali Prose 166
  2. Poetry 171
  3. Novels 173
  4. Drama 175
  5. Miscellaneous 176
IV. Assamese—by Dr. S. K. Chatterji, M.A., D.Litt., F.A.S., *President, Bengal Legislative Council and Professor Emeritus, University of Calcutta,* and R. C. Majumdar 178
V. Oriya—by R. C. Majumdar 179
VI. Hindi—by S. K. Chatterji and R. C. Majumdar .. 181
VII. Marathi—by (late) K. P. Kulkarni, J.P., M.A.B.T. 184
Head of The Marathi Department, Elphinstone College, Bombay.
VIII. Gujarati—by K. M. Munshi, B.A. LL.B. D.Litt., 190
President, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan.
  1. 1818-1852 190
  2. 1852-1886 191
  3. 1886-1905 192

Page
IX. Tamil—by K. R. S. Iyengar, M.A., D.Litt., .. 195
Professor of English, Andhra University
X. Telugu—by S. V. Joga Rao, M.A., Ph.D., ... 198
Lecturer, Andhra University.
XI. Kannada—by Prof. S. Srikantha Sastri 200
(Retired) Professor of History, Mysore University.
XII. Malayalam—by P. K. Parameswaran Nair, ... 202
Supervisor, Malayalam Lexicon, University of Kerala
1. The age of Swathi Thirunal 202
2. Impact of English Education 203
3. Prose Literature 204
4. The Novels 205
5. Drama and Poetry 205
6. Literary Criticism 207
7. Translations 207
XIII. Indian Contribution to Arabic Literature—by M. W. Mirza 208
(Retired) Professor of Arabic, Lucknow University.
XIV. Indian Contribution to Persian Literature—by M. W. Mirza 211
XV. Urdu—by S. K. Chatterji 214
XVI. Indo-Anglian Literature—by K. R. Srinivasa Iyengar, M.A., D.Litt., ... 215
Professor of English, Andhra University
XVII. Scripts in India of the present day—by S. K. Chatterji 218

CHAPTER VI (XLIV)

THE PRESS

By R. C. Majumdar

I. Growth of Indian Press up to 1857 222
II. The Government and the Press 228
III. The Press during the outbreak of 1857-58 237
IV. The Press after 1858 240

CHAPTER VII (XLV)

SOCIAL REFORM

By R. C. Majumdar

I. Principles of reform 256
II. General Review 260
III. Sati 268
IV. Infanticide 275
V. Remarriage of widows 276
VI. Slavery 278
VII. The Emancipation Act 280
VIII. Post-Mutiny Reforms 281
IX. Education of Women 284

CHAPTER VIII (XLVI)

MUSLIM COMMUNITY

By R. C. MAJUMDAR

Page

I. Muslim politics before the Aligarh Movement .. 295
II. The Aligarh Movement 305
III. Divide and Rule 320
IV. Hindu-Muslim relations 325

Appendix

Hindu-Muslim riots 332
1. Thana (Bombay) riots (1837) 332
2. Broach riot (1857) 332
3. Janjira riots (1877) 333
4. Anti-kine-killing riots in Bihar (1893-94) .. 333
5. Calcutta riots (1897) 334

CHAPTER IX (XLVII)

SOCIAL RELATION BETWEEN ENGLISHMEN AND INDIANS .. 337

By R. C. MAJUMDAR

CHAPTER X (XLVIII)

BRITISH POLICY TOWARDS INDIA .. 381

By R. C. MAJUMDAR

CHAPTER XI (XLIX)

THE ATTITUDE OF INDIANS TOWARDS BRITISH RULE .. 418

By R. C. MAJUMDAR

CHAPTER XII (L)

GROWTH OF POLITICAL IDEAS AND POLITICAL ORGANIZATIONS (UP TO 1858)

By R. C. MAJUMDAR

I. Introduction 431
II. Bengal 434
III. Political ideas and associations outside Bengal .. 456
A. Bombay 456
B. Madras 462

CHAPTER XIII (LI)

BIRTH OF NATIONALISM .. 465

By R. C. MAJUMDAR

CHAPTER XIV (LII)

DEVELOPMENT OF POLITICAL IDEAS AND ORGANIZATIONS (1858-85)

By R. C. Majumdar

Page

I. Bengal 499
II. Bombay and Madras 515
III. Political Propaganda in England 518
Appendix:
Sarvajanik Sabha—Poona 521

CHAPTER XV (LIII)

THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS

By R. C. Majumdar

I. The Genesis 524
II. The first twenty sessions of the Congress (1885-1904) 536
III. The British reaction to the Indian National Congress. 551
IV. Political work in England 562
V. The relation of the Indian National Congress with the old political associations 565

CHAPTER XVI (LIV)

THE NATIONALIST MOVEMENT IN POLITICS

By R. C. Majumdar

I. Rise of the Nationalist Party 570
II. Beginnings of militant nationalism 589

CHAPTER XVII (LV)

INDIAN SERFS AND SLAVES IN THE BRITISH EMPIRE

By R. C. Majumdar

I. In India 595
Tea-garden labourers in Assam
  1. The history of the coolies in Assam tea-gardens 595
  2. System of recruiting coolies 598
  3. Condition of the coolies in the Assam tea-gardens 602
  4. Brutality of the tea-planters admitted by the highest British officials 610
    a. General review 610
    b. Miscarriage of justice 611

Page

II. Outside India
1. The indenture system 611
2. The Island of Mauritius 613
3. The Indians in South Africa 617
Bibliography 626
Chronology 647
Index 669

ABBREVIATIONS

Cf. Vol. IX, pp. xxxv-xxxviii. The following additional abbreviations are used:—

B P P	*Bengal Past and Present.*
H B S	*History of Bengal,* Vol. II, Edited by Sir Jadunath Sarkar, Dacca.
Rammohan	*Rammohun Roy, The Man and His Work.* Edited by Amal Home and Published by the Rammohun Centenary Committee. Calcutta, 1933 (also referred to as Centenary Volume).

PREFACE

By Dr. R. C. Majumdar

General Editor

This volume really forms a part of Vol. IX, and was originally planned as such; but as the achievement of independence made it possible as well as necessary to give a more detailed and critical history of the period from 1818 to 1905, Vol. IX exceeded the normal size and was split up into two parts. For the convenience of reference the two parts have been treated as separate volumes, with separate numbering of pages and chapters; but, to indicate the continuity, the original number of chapters in the undivided volume has been indicated within brackets in this volume.

The relation between the two parts, i.e., Vols. IX and X, has been explained in the Preface to Vol. IX. While Vol. IX deals with the political and economic history of India from 1818 to 1905, this volume treats of the other aspects of Indian life during the same period with the Renaissance as its central theme. It accordingly begins with a short account of the general condition of the Indian people at the beginning of the nineteenth century (Ch. I) and then describes the introduction of English education and its general impact on Indian people (Chaps. II, III), leading to what is justly regarded as the Renaissance of India. A detailed account is then given of some of the prominent aspects of the Renaissance, such as the change in religious and social ideas, the growth of new types of literature, and the rise of the Press as an important factor in Indian life (Chs. IV-VII). The most important aspect of the Renaissance, namely, political organization and the development of nationalism which distinguished the period under review from all preceding epochs in Indian history, is dealt with in five chapters (XII-XVI), preceded by four chapters (VIII-XI) which supply the background of political evolution.

A few words are necessary to indicate the scope, object, and necessity of the concluding chapter which marks a departure from the current books on the modern history of India, written both by the Indians and Englishmen. It deals with the state of slavery and semi-slavery to which a large number of Indians were reduced, both at home and abroad, by Englishmen who uprooted the plant of slavery elsewhere in their dominions only to grow and nurture it on Indian soil. The depth of degradation to which these Indians were condemned, and the brutalities to which they were often subjected, with the full knowledge, and sometimes tacit consent, of the British Government, is a sad commentary on the oft-expressed anxiety of the British rulers of India to guard the interests of her common people, who formed the bulk of the population, as against the microscopic minority of the educated middle class. There is, however, no cloud without a silver lining. The miserable lot of the Indian slaves overseas served as an incentive to India's struggle for freedom. How deeply it stirred the emotions of the politically conscious Indians may be gathered from the resolutions on the subject passed year after year at the annual meetings of the Indian National Congress. Apart from this aspect, the stolid, almost criminal, indifference of the British to the indescribable misery and utter humiliation of the Indian labourers and free citizens in the Colonies is mainly responsible for the barbarous and universally condemned policy (or impolicy) of 'apartheid' now adopted by the White People of South Africa and their general attitude to the coloured inhabitants of the country.

The materials for the study of the aspects of history dealt with in this volume are not as varied and ample as is the case with the political and economic history which forms the subject-matter of Vol. IX. The official records, except in a few particular cases, do not directly throw much light on the various topics discussed in this volume. The British authors of Indian history, like the court chroniclers of the Medieval period, were mostly interested in the British conquests and administration, and seldom concerned themselves with the people except as adjuncts to the political and administrative history which constituted their main and central theme. *The Cambridge History of India,* for example, allots less than a dozen pages to the topics (except English education and *Sati*) dealt with in this volume, and does not refer, even once, to the Renaissance that changed the face of India, though an entire volume of 680 pages is devoted to the history of sixty years covering the period from 1858 to 1918. The same thing is more or less true of the volumes of Indian history written by earlier British authors, mentioned in the Preface to Vol. IX (p. xxiii) as important sources of political history.

Although there is no historical work dealing with the subject, as a whole, treated in this volume, the materials for writing it are not very scanty. Valuable data for studying the development of various aspects of Renaissance in India lie scattered in the periodicals and literary works—specially memoirs on particular topics and biographies or autobiographies of eminent persons. Unfortunately, much of these materials could not be utilized in the present volume, mainly for two reasons. In the first place, old periodicals are not easily available. Secondly, many of these as well as other literary works are written in regional languages, and there is no English translation. No historian knows all the Indian languages, and co-operative effort such as has been adopted in the chapter on literature could not be extended to others for very obvious reasons. It is therefore inevitable that the literary evidence in Bengali language, with which the author of these chapters is familiar, has been more extensively used than that in other languages. This was further facilitated by the fact that two Bengali scholars have performed the laborious task of collecting and classifying useful extracts from a few old Bengali periodicals. If similar studies be undertaken with reference to old periodicals in other regional languages, it would be possible to give fuller and better accounts of modern India. Fortunately, many good books—memoirs, biographies, essays and studies on special topics—have been written in English in different parts of India, throwing valuable light on the progress of Renaissance in these regions. These enable us to draw up the general outline of this development which must suffice for the present, leaving the details and illustrative examples for the future.

The delineation of the Hindu-Muslim and Indo-British relations (Chs. VIII-XI) presents a peculiar difficulty to which reference has been made in the Prefaces to Vol. VI (pp. xxix-xxxii) and Vol. IX (p. xxxiii) of this series, and the editor has nothing to add to what has been said there. The editor once more reminds the readers that though many unpleasant, sometimes even painful, remarks have been made for the sake of historical truth, the writer bears malice to none and goodwill to all. The history of mankind is largely a tale of woe and misery, brought about by the greed, cruelty and selfishness of men, and India has been no exception to the rule. Still that history has to be told, not merely for the sake of truth, but also for the edification of, and warning to, posterity. To ignore or belittle historical truth, with a view to promoting peace, harmony or goodwill, may be of immediate advantage, but certainly does great harm in the long run. Courage to face truth, however unpleasant, paves the way for better understanding in future. The editor has kept this in view while depicting the relations between the Hindus, Muslims and the British in India during the period under review.

Of the development of political ideas and organizations in general, and of nationalism in particular, there are abundant materials. It has been treated in detail as it forms the background of

India's struggle for freedom which forms the central theme of the next volume in this series. Though some of the nationalist ideas reached their maturity and found full and formal expression only after 1905, their beginnings may be traced before that year, and hence they have been noticed in this volume, particularly as their impact upon political movement was felt even before that year was over.

It is as difficult to fix a definite date for the development of a new idea as to draw up a chronological chart for the different phases of the development of literature. One merges into the other so naturally and in such slow and gradual stages that it is not easy to fix any chronological boundary between them. This difficulty has been conspicuously felt in chapter V dealing with regional literature, and it has been aggravated by the fact that the natural divisions in the growth of a literature may not always agree with the different epochs of political history according to which the different volumes of this series have been arranged. As a result, the end of some sections in literature may appear to be somewhat abrupt. Sometimes the literary activities of one and the same author extend fairly over many years both before and after 1905, with which this volume closes, and it is difficult to decide whether to include him in the present volume and anticipate his later career, or to reverse the process, leaving a gap in the present volume. The case of Rabindranath Tagore offers a good illustration. His literary career will be dealt with in the next volume though some of his good works were published long before 1905. Even such arbitrary choice appeared to be preferable to the division of his career into two halves to be treated in two separate volumes.

A still greater difficulty of the same kind faces us in the domain of art. It is very remarkable that the Renaissance in India was not marked by an efflorescence of art such as we notice in Europe. The nineteenth century in India, so rich in literature at least in Bengal, did not bring about any revival of art tradition even in that Province before the very end of the period under review. The Bengal School of painting founded by Abanindra-nath Tagore has justly been described by Dr. Coomaraswamy as 'a phase of the national re-awakening'. But its real development by him and his pupils took place only in the present century. So far as the nineteenth century is concerned, we find either the last glowing embers of the Kangra School represented by Kapur Singh, or imitations of European oil-painting by Raja Ravi Varma, Alagiri Naidu, Ramaswamy Naidu and others. As it would be more appropriate to include the last phase of Kangra art in Vol. VIII, and the development of national as well as Europeanized School of art in Vol. XI, Art as a subject has been altogether omitted in this volume. It may be added that this decision was further influenced by the fact that there has been no significant development in the other two branches of art, viz., architecture and sculpture, in the nineteenth century. The fine stone or bronze images which we find in different parts of India were almost all imported from Europe, and the few buildings which may claim any architectural excellence are based on European model and mostly designed by European architects. Perhaps no epoch in Indian history has been so poor in artistic achievement as the period of British rule in India.

The editor begs to draw the attention of the readers to the policy and principles enunciated in pp. xxxiii-xxxiv, and the method of execution described in p. xxx of Vol. IX, which are equally applicable to this volume. Like Vol. IX, the editor himself is the author of all the chapters of this volume except a small section in the Chapter (IV) on religion, major part of the chapter (V) on literature, and a part of the chapter (II) on English Education. The reasons in both cases are the same and have been stated in p. xxx of Vol. IX. It is needless to add that the general observations in the Preface to Vol. IX, particularly those in pp. xxx ff., are more or less applicable to this volume also.

For reasons stated in the Preface to Vol. IX diacritical marks have generally been omitted except in Chapters IV and V.

The editor notes with deep regret the death of Dr. D. C. Ganguly who contributed several chapters to Vols. IV and V, and of Dr. K. M. Panikkar who wrote a section of Ch. XXX of Vol. IX. The editor also notes with deep sorrow that Prof. K. P. Kulkarni, M.A., who wrote the section on Marathi Language and Literature in chapter V of this volume passed away on 12 June, 1964, when it was in the press. The editor takes this opportunity of placing on record his appreciation of the great services rendered by all the three to the cause of Indian history and culture.

Both Dr. A. K. Majumdar and Dr. D. K. Ghose have rendered valuable service as Assistant Editors to this volume and the editor thanks them both. He also conveys his thanks to the contributors of chapters II, IV and V, and expresses his deep obligation to Dr. S. K. Chatterji, M.A., D.Litt., F.A.S., for his valuable help and suggestions regarding the chapter on Literature.

The next and the last volume of this series will cover the period from 1905 to 1947 and is expected to be out before the end of the next year.

CHAPTER I (XXXIX)

THE INDIAN PEOPLE AT THE BEGINNING OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

The most powerful effect and enduring result of the British rule in India is the intellectual development of the people on an entirely new line, and the consequent changes in their political, social, religious, and economic outlook. It may be said without much exaggeration, that during the period of less than a century, covered by this volume, India passed from the medieval to modern age.

This great transformation took place first in Bengal where the British rule had been the longest, and then in other parts of India, as the British rule came to be established over their people more and more thoroughly. The process of development followed more or less the same line everywhere, but it is easier to trace it from beginning to end more minutely and definitely in Bengal than in any other province.

Besides, there is another good reason why this study should begin with Bengal. This is forcefully expressed by Sir Jadu-nath Sarkar in the following words:

"If Periclean Athens was the school of Hellas, the eye of Greece, mother of arts and eloquence, that was Bengal to the rest of India under British rule, but with a borrowed light which it had made its own with marvellous cunning. In this new Bengal originated every good and great thing of the modern world that passed on to the other provinces of India. From Bengal went forth the English-educated teachers and the Europe-inspired thought that helped to modernise Bihar and Orissa, Hindustan and Deccan. New literary types, reform of the language, social reconstruction, political aspirations, religious movements and even changes in manners that originated in Bengal, passed like ripples from a central eddy, accross provincial barriers, to the furthest corners of India".[1]

In order to understand, therefore, the nature and magnitude of the great transformation it is better to concentrate attention mainly on that region. It will be convenient to begin with a general description of the people of Bengal at the beginning of the nineteenth century before they received any impact from the West, laying special emphasis on those aspects which were more vitally affected by the force of that impact.

Although the British became virtually rulers of Bengal after the battle of Plassey in 1757, it took some years for the people of

Bengal to realize the change. For, to a large extent, the old framework of administration, centring round the titular Nawab of Murshidabad, continued for some years and the real transference of power from his hands to the British Governor in Calcutta was effected very slowly and by degrees. The establishment of the New Council and Supreme Court in Calcutta and the appointment of Warren Hastings as Governor-General in 1774 must have first brought home to the people that there was a real change in political authority. During the twenty-six years that followed, the establishment of British supremacy was not only an accomplished fact, but was generally recognized to be so by the people of Bengal.

It would be interesting to know the first reaction of the people to this great change. The contemporary literature is, however, too scanty to enable us to form a correct idea of the situation. But there is nothing to show that apart from families or individuals who were directly affected, the middle class or the masses took any serious view of this change from a political point of view. The economic consequences were, of course, disastrous to the people, and they suffered terribly; but there is no indication that there was any general outcry against the alien rulers as such, far less any idea of organized resistance against them.

One of the reasons for the comparative indifference of the Bengalis to the momentous events of 1757 seems to be the occurrence of similar political changes in recent times. Alivardi Khan, whose grandson and successor Siraj-ud-daulah was defeated by the British at Plassey (Palasi) in 1757, had himself usurped the throne by a similar *coup d'etat* only 17 years before, and Mir Jafar, who owed his throne to the English, could claim as good a title to the allegiance of the people as the rulers he succeeded. To-day it is customary to look upon the victory of the British at Plassey as an epoch-making event in Indian history, and regard it as marking the foundation of British rule in India. The people of Bengal had neither reason nor justification to view it in this light. They looked upon the accession of Mir Jafar as one usurper and traitor succeeding another, and it was beyond their wildest dreams to see in this event the beginning of British rule in Bengal, far less in India.

There was another reason which operated against the normal feeling of aversion to, or repulsion against, foreign rule. To the Hindus, who formed the majority of the population of British dominions in Bengal, it was the replacement of one foreign rule by another, and not the loss of independence for the first time. The most convincing evidence in this respect is furnished by the court-life during the rule of the last Nawabs of Bengal.

In this respect we have the evidence of Colonel Scott who had probably more intimate knowledge of the court and people of Bengal than any other Englishman. The opinion he expressed some time about 1754 is thus summarised by C. F. Noble in a letter to the Select Committee, Fort Saint George, dated 22 September, 1756:

"By what Colonel Scott observed in Bengal the *jentue rajahs* (i.e. the Hindu chiefs) and inhabitants were very much disaffected to the Moor Government, and secretly wished for a change and opportunity of throwing off their tyrannical yoke. And was of opinion that if an European force began successfully, that they would be inclined to join them if properly applied to and encouraged, but might be cautious how they acted at first until they had a probability of success in bringing about a Revolution to their advantage."[2]

This opinion proved to be only too true. With the exception of a very few, all the Hindu politicians disliked Siraj-ud-daulah and joined in the conspiracy of 1757 against the Nawab. Mir Jafar was also not on good terms with the Hindu officers and similar was the case with Mir Qasim. Had Mir Qasim been ably supported by Shitab Rai and his party, the history of Bengal might perhaps have been different. The cause of the English was greatly furthered by the assistance of Shitab Rai, his son Kalyan Singh, and others. Shitab Rai spared no pains to poison the mind of the English against the Nawab and was greatly instrumental in bringing about his downfall. Kalyan Singh has himself related (*Khulasat-ut-Tawarikh*) in plain words his own activities and those of his father and others in favour of the English. They greatly popularised the English cause at the courts of the Delhi Emperor and of the Nawab Wazir of Oudh, and persuaded the Emperor to grant the Diwani to the East India Company on 12 August, 1765. The supporters and partisans of the English were almost all Hindus. The English refugees at Fulta in 1756 were helped greatly by Raja Nabakrishna and some of the merchants of Calcutta, though Nawab Siraj-ud-daulah had passed strict orders against helping them in any way.[3]

Seven hundred years of foreign rule had sapped the political vitality of the Hindus and uprooted whatever national consciousness they ever possessed. This explains, though it does not excuse, their indifference to the new foreign conquest and attempt to turn it to their own advantage. Lord Clive, after his victory at Palasi (Plassey) made a triumphal entry into the capital city of Murshidabad at the head of 200 Europeans and 500 sepoys. He observed "that the inhabitants, who were spectators on that occasion, must have amounted to some hundreds of thousands; and if they had an inclination to have destroyed the Europeans they might have done it with sticks and stones".[4] One, imbued with modern ideas, may feel surprised that the inhabitants of Murshidabad showed no such inclination. But it is not difficult to offer an adequate explanation of their attitude. In modern age the people conceive the State to be their own with recognized rights and duties, and hence they are ready to defend it with the last drop of their blood. But we cannot expect the same thing in a State which the majority of the people did not look upon as their own, and in which they possessed no right whatsoever. As Seeley has observed, 'where the Government ceases to rest upon right, the State loses its right to appeal to patriotism'. The following observation by the same writer seems to reflect correctly the state of things in India and offers a good explanation of the conduct of the Hindus of Bengal in those days.

"We regard it as the duty of a man to fight for his country against the foreigner. But what is a man's country? When we analyse the notion, we find it presupposes the man to have been bred up in a community which may be regarded as a great family, so that it is natural for him to think of the land itself as a mother. But if the community has not been at all of the nature of a family, but has been composed of two or three races hating each other, (and one of which has denied the others elementary and most valuable rights of a citizen), if not the country, but at most the village has been regarded as a home, then it is not the fault of the natives of it that they have no patriotism but village-patriotism. It is one thing to receive a foreign yoke for the first time, and quite a different thing to exchange one foreign yoke for another."[5]

It is therefore easy to understand why the British could win over political authority in Bengal, practically without any opposition from the Hindus.

When the British rule was firmly established in Bengal, the anti-Muslim and pro-British sentiments of the Hindus went on increasing. This is evident from the statement of Raja Rammohan Roy. He was a great scholar in Arabic, Persian and Muslim learning, and, as will be shown later, regarded the Muslims as superior to the Hindus in many respects. Nevertheless, he regarded the British rule in India as a benign act of Providence.[5a] In his famous "Appeal to the King in Council" against the Press Regulation he contrasts the advantages and disadvantages of the people under their former Muhammadan rulers with those under the British rule, and refers to the "despotic power of the Mogul Princes who formerly ruled over this country".[6] Elsewhere the Raja says, with reference to the religious bigotry and proselytisation of the Muslims, that "we have been subjected to such insults for about nine centuries".[7] Some of his other utterances on the same line will be quoted later in this chapter. Even early vernacular periodicals contrasted the period of the Hindu Rajas with that of the Musalmans. The view of Muslims as alien rulers persisted throughout the nineteenth century among the Hindus, and is reflected in later periodicals and literary works. The great Bengali writer Bankim-chandra Chatterji, who died in A.D. 1894, gave forceful expression to it in many of his writings.

The attitude of the Muslims towards the British rule in Bengal is more difficult to judge. That there was a sullen resentment against the imposition of British rule in Bengal and Bihar appears clear from the later Wahabi movement and its offshoots which had a strong centre in this region. But there was no active resistance at the moment. This seems to be due to some of the general causes mentioned above, such as change of ruling dynasties in recent times and absence of a national feeling or consciousness of political rights. But the chief reason seems to be that the Muslims formed a minority in Bengal and were generally less advanced in all spheres of life. More important still, they did not possess an aristocratic class which supplied the natural leaders to the people in those days. On account of the prolonged resistance of the local chiefs, the Mughul Emperors could effectively establish their suzerainty in Bengal only after a great deal of difficulty extending over a long period. Hence, to secure their hold, they followed the policy of appointing Governors and high officials in this province from among men of Upper India who retired to their own home after the end of their term of service. It was Murshid Quli Khan (died A.D. 1727) who for the first time established a ruling family in Bengal, and appointed local men as high officials. But the usurper Alivardi Khan, who wrested the throne from his family in 1740, made it a policy to appoint Hindus to high offices by way of a check against the Muslim adherents of the late ruling family. Thus there was no Muslim aristocracy, either of birth or of service, of long standing, which could organise an open resistance against the British.

It is thus quite intelligible why the establishment of British supremacy in Bengal did not evoke any general protest or resentment, far less any active revolt, among the Hindus. The Muslims, who formed a minority, cherished a feeling of bitter resentment, but it found no outward expression.

Whatever might have been the first reaction of the Hindus against the British rule, there is no doubt that they not only reconciled themselves to it, but grew friendly, or even devoted, to the new rulers. Here, again, we may quote the views of Raja Rammohan

Roy. In his autobiographical sketch, written in the form of a letter to a friend, the Raja says that at the age of sixteen (c. A.D. 1790) he cherished "a feeling of great aversion to the establishment of the British power in India". "But", he continues, "when I had reached the age of twenty.......I first saw and began to associate with Europeans, and soon after made myself tolerably acquainted with their laws and form of government. Finding them generally more intelligent, more steady and moderate in their conduct, I gave up my prejudice against them, and became inclined in their favour, feeling persuaded that their rule, though a foreign yoke, would lead more speedily and surely to the amelioration of the native inhabitants."[8] It must be noted in this connection that the change in Rammohan's feeling cannot be attributed to English education. For he only began to learn English at the age of 22 (A.D. 1796) and as John Digby, under whom he served, tells us, even in A.D. 1805 he (Rammohan) "could merely speak it well enough to be understood upon the most common topics of discourse, but could not write it with any degree of correctness."[9]

This friendly attitude of the Hindus towards the British rulers brings to the forefront the general cleavage between the Hindus and Muslims in Bengal. In a written memorandum on the 'Judicial System of India' which Raja Rammohan Roy submitted before a Committee of the House of Commons, we find the following questions and answers:—

Q. What is your opinion of the judicial character and conduct of the Hindu and Muhammadan lawyers attached to the courts?

A. Among the Muhammadan lawyers, I have met with some honest men. The Hindu lawyers are in general not well spoken of and they do not enjoy much of the confidence of the public.

In other answers, also, he contrasts the Hindus with the Muslims, and elsewhere he writes:—"I have observed with respect to distant cousins, sprung from the same family and living in the same district, when one branch of the family had been converted to Mussalmanism, that those of the Muhammadan branch living in a freer manner, were distinguished by greater bodily activity and capacity for exertion, than those of the other branch which had adhered to the Hindoo simple mode of life".[10]

The questions and answers show that the Hindus and the Muslims were regarded both by the British and the Indians as two separate communities with distinct cultures and different physical, mental, and moral characteristics:

In the vernacular newspapers of the first quarter of the nineteenth century we find the Muslims referred to as *'yavana-jāti'* and a clear distinction is made between them and the Hindus. In 1833 two students of the Hindu College were appointed teachers of the Murshidabad School. It is reported in a vernacular paper dated February 13, 1836, that one of these died shortly after his arrival and the other, though highly qualified, was not liked by the Muslims simply because he was a Hindu. So he resigned in May 1835.[11] In general, we find among the regulations of the new schools, that it was open to all communities, Christians, Hindus and Muslims, but the Hindu College was open to the Hindus alone. Indeed such distinction is tacitly accepted, and even as late as 12 August, 1869, a long article on the Muslims in the *Amritabazar Patrika* begins with the statement that the population is divided into two classes, namely, the Hindus and the Muslims, and traces the origin of the majority of the Muslims to the conversion of low class Hindus.[12] Throughout the nineteenth century this sharp distinction between the Hindu and Muslim communities is reflected in Bengali literature, and there was good reason for it. In order to explain this a brief reference must be made to the position of the Muslims *vis-à-vis* the Hindus at the beginning of the nineteenth century.

The loss of political power and prestige made the Muslims less arrogant towards the Hindus, and considerably curtailed their anti-Hindu activities inspired by religious bigotry. The long residence as neighbours, for nearly six centuries, must have brought them closer together in ordinary affairs of daily life, and there must have been some assimilation in thoughts and ideas. Above all, the common subjection to an alien rule awakened a sort of fellow-feeling which adversity shared together seldom fails to develop. All these factors brought about a more harmonious and friendly relation, removed many of the angularities, and to a large degree blunted the edge of ill feeling or hostility between the two communities. But the fundamental and basic differences, to which reference has been made above,[13] still remained and operated as a barrier between them almost as strong as before. While the radical differences in religious and social ideas and practices had not been modified to any appreciable extent, the historical traditions, another potent factor which kept the two communities separate, gathered force with the expansion and stability of Muslim rule in India. It is interesting to note how, apart from social and religious institutions which created a permanent cleavage between the two, even the differences in less important matters continued without any visible sign of diminution.

The literary and intellectual traditions of the two communities ran on almost entirely different lines. They were educated in different institutions, *Tols* and *Madrasas.* The Muslims drew their inspiration from Arabic and Persian literature. A small number of Hindus knew Persian, and only a few learnt Arabic, but the Hindu mind was nurtured from the boyhood on Sanskrit, particularly religious, literature like the Epics and the Puranas, to which the Muslims were almost strangers. It is a strange phenomenon that although the Muslims and Hindus had lived together in Bengal for nearly six hundred years, the average people of each community knew so little of the other's history, literature, ideas and traditions.

The Hindus believed that the majority of the Muslims in Bengal were converts from the lowest strata of Hindu society. How far this belief is historically correct has been discussed above.[14] But, right or wrong, the belief was there,[15] and there is no doubt that the upper class Hindus treated the Muslim masses in many respects like the low castes of their own society. Even in the closing years of the nineteenth century, in most villages, the Muslims, who visited a caste Hindu's house, had, with rare exceptions, to sit in the verandah on a mat or even on bare ground, and were not admitted inside a room, or given any seat which should be offered to a man of equal status. Nevertheless, it is interesting to note that, generally speaking, there was no rancour, animosity, or ill-feeling on that account between the two communities, so severely kept asunder by religious and social barriers.

There was no social intercourse between the two communities as we understand the term to-day, for a Hindu would not take food or even a glass of water touched by a Muslim, and would lose his caste and religion if he did so. This did not, however, prevent a Hindu from being a guest at the house of a Muslim or *vice versa.* Each would scrupulously respect the feelings and sentiments of the other, and provide for the food agreeable to him. Many respectable Muslims maintained a permanent kitchen under Hindu management for their Hindu guests, and Hindus would either do the same or arrange with a Muslim neighbour for the food of their Muslim guests.

Many popular beliefs, even superstitions, reverence for holy saints and festivals of the other community, folk-songs and popular pastimes, and even some social etiquette and customs were shared in common by the two communities. But although these were signs of the growth of good feeling, they were after all minor features and did not touch the essentials of life. In all matters vitally affecting life and culture, the Hindus and Muslims lived in almost two watertight compartments. Unlike other foreign conquerers—Greeks, Sakas, Kushanas and Hunas in India, or Angles, Saxons, Danes and

Normans in England—the Muslims were never fused with the conquered people, and there was no prospect of it even in distant future. Reference may be made in this connection to the following extract from the *Siyar-ul-Mutakherin*, whose author Sayyid Ghulam Husain Khan lived towards the close of the eighteenth century.

"And although the Gentoos seem to be a generation apart and distinct from the rest of mankind, and they are swayed by such differences in religion, tenets and rites, as will necessarily render all Musulmen aliens and profane, in their eyes; and although they keep up a strangeness of ideas and practices, which beget a wide difference in customs and actions; yet in process of time, they drew nearer and nearer; and as soon as fear and aversion had worn away, we see that this dissimilarity and alienation have terminated in friendship and union, and that the two nations have come to coalesce together into one whole, like milk and sugar that have received a simmering. In one word, we have seen them promote heartily each other's welfare, have common ideas, like brothers from one and the same mother, and feel for each other, as children of the same family".[16]

Ghulam Husain's analysis of the fundamental differences between the Hindus and Muslims is in agreement with the view mentioned above. His reference to the amity between the two communities may be accepted as generally true, but he undoubtedly exaggerates its extent when he says that "the two nations coalesced together into one whole, like milk and sugar". Indeed this is contradicted by the first part of his own observation, and also by unchallenged facts. The Hindus looked down upon the Muslims as unclean, and even for the slightest contact with them, in violation of orthodox rules, a Hindu was condemned to a perpetual exclusion from his society. If a Hindu took food from a Muslim house, even unknowingly, or a Hindu woman was touched by a Muslim, the entire family was driven out of the Hindu fold and forced to take up the Muslim faith. These rigours and restrictions, which hardly fit in with the theory of coalescence, gradually increased the number of the Muslims in Bengal, so much so that while they formed only one-third of the population of Bengal at the middle of the nineteenth century,[17] their number increased to more than half in course of a hundred years. Thus, though the Hindus and Muslims formed two water-tight compartments to begin with, water soon began to leak from one into the other, but not *vice versa*. The Hindu society had wide exits but no entrance. To use Ghulam Husain's metaphor, Hindu sugar was dissolved in the Muslim milk and it was the absorption of the Hindus by Muslims, and not a coalescence or fusion of the two communities.

In spite of good neighbourly feeling the fundamental differences between the two were never ignored, far less forgotten, by either side. On occasions, though fortunately rare, there were tensions between the two, generated by religious and social differences and historical traditions. The spirit of ill will and hatred even led to ugly communal riots to which reference will be made later. But these quarrels were soon made up, and the even tenor of life was resumed by both. During the early period of British rule the differences were levelled down to a considerable degree by the common subjection to a foreign rule, but they reappeared with the growth of political consciousness. The fundamental and basic difference was patent to all, and the English rulers took full advantage of it by playing one against the other. But though the English exploited the difference between the two communities, it was in no sense created by them. It was always there, and they merely used it to maintain or advance their own interests. The fundamental differences were briefly described as follows, by way of justifying the view that the Hindus and Muslims were two distinct nations, by one who first mooted the idea of Pakistan in 1930: "Our religion, culture, history, tradition, literature, economic system, laws of inheritance, succession and marriage are fundamentally different from those of the Hindus. These differences are not confined to the broad basic principles. They extend to the minute details of our lives. We, Muslims and Hindus, do not interdine; we do not intermarry. Our national customs and calendars, even our diet and dress, are different."[17a] It would be difficult to deny that this statement was as true in A.D. 1800 (or 1200) as in 1930.

Though in contrast with the Muslims the Hindus may be regarded as forming a single separate community, it lacked internal cohesion on account of the numerous castes which sub-divided it. It is true that except in matters of intermarriage and interdining, the so-called higher castes had not any basic difference among themselves, but there was an almost insuperable barrier between the caste-Hindus and the untouchables. The latter were treated as distinctly inferior in every respect by the rest, who not only refused all kinds of social intercourse with them but, in some parts of India, even regarded their very sight as unclean. Though they were all included in the same religious fold, these classes were refused entry into the temples and the service of the Brahman priests. These details are too well-known to be repeated, but the rigidity of the caste system among the Hindus must be borne in mind in forming an estimate of the national feeling among the people of India.

What has been stated above, in respect of Bengal, applies more or less equally to all other parts of India. There can be hardly any doubt that the cleavage between the Hindus and Muslims, and the caste-distinctions among the former, were great obstacles to the formation of a national consciousness, even among the people of a single province like Bengal. It is hardly necessary to point out that there was no consciousness of unity among the peoples of India as a whole. The memory and tradition of the eighteenth century, when every man's hand was against his neighbour, persisted still in creating a wide gulf between the different regions of India.

The liberal character of British rule, specially its judicial administration and "the literary and political improvements which are continually going on",[18] made a very favourable impression upon the Hindus who contrasted it with the decadent system of Muslim rule in the eighteenth century, so strongly marked by inefficiency, corruption, and exactions to an almost incredible degree. This is specially true of the upper classes and intelligentsia among the Hindus. Anyone who even cursorily glances through the journals or public addresses of prominent Hindu leaders in Bengal during the first half of the nineteenth century will be surprised at the violent denunciation of the Muslim rule and the enthusiastic, almost rapturous, applause of the British administration which supplanted it.

The most important and interesting testimony in this respect is furnished by Raja Rammohan Roy whose deep erudition in Muslim learning and general bringing up preclude the idea of any bias against the Muslim community. He mentions both the merits and defects of Muslim rule in the following passage of his 'Appeal to the King in Council': "Your Majesty is aware, that under their former Muhammadan Rulers, the natives of this country enjoyed every political privilege in common with Mussulmans, being eligible to the highest offices in the state, entrusted with the command of armies and the government of provinces, and often chosen as advisers to their Prince, without disqualification or degrading distinction on account of their religion or the place of their birth. They used to receive free grants of land exempted from any payments of revenue, and besides the highest salaries allowed under the Government they enjoyed free of charge large tracts of country attached to certain offices of trust and dignity, while natives of learning and talent were rewarded with numerous situations of honour and emolument. Although under the British Rule, the natives of India have entirely lost this political consequence, your Majesty's faithful subjects were consoled by the more secure enjoyment of those civil and religious rights which had been so often violated by the rapacity and intolerance of the Mussulmans; and notwithstanding the loss of political rank and power, they considered themselves much happier in the enjoyment of civil and religious liberty than were their ancestors;..."[19]

It may be mentioned in passing that the blessings of Muslim rule mentioned by the Raja may be said to be true of only a very short period of Muslim rule, roughly extending from the middle of the sixteenth to the close of the seventeenth century A.D., in other words for less than 150 years, out of more than 800 (according to the calculation of the Raja). Nevertheless the Raja leaves no doubt where his sympathies lay. In para 3 of the same Appeal he says:

"The greater part of Hindustan having been for several centuries subject to Muhammadan Rule, the civil and religious rights of its original inhabitants were constantly trampled upon, and from the habitual oppression of the conquerors, a great body of their subjects in the southern Peninsula (Dukhin), afterwards called Marhattahs, and another body in the western parts now styled Sikhs, were at last driven to revolt; and when the Mussulman power became feeble, they ultimately succeeded in establishing their independence; but the Natives of Bengal wanting vigor of body, and adverse to active exertion, remained during the whole period of the Muhammadan conquest, faithful to the existing Government, although their property was often plundered, their religion insulted, and their blood wantonly shed. Divine Providence at last, in its abundant mercy, stirred up the English nation to break the yoke of those tyrants, and to receive the oppressed Natives of Bengal under its protection".[20]

The Raja concludes his "Appeal to the Christian Public" with the following words: "I now conclude my Essay by offering up thanks to the Supreme Disposer of the events of this universe, for having unexpectedly delivered this country from the long-continued tyranny of its former Rulers, and placed it under the government of the English,—a nation who not only are blessed with the enjoyment of civil and political liberty, but also interest themselves in promoting liberty and social happiness, as well as free inquiry into literary and religious subjects, among those nations to which their influence extends".[21] But Rammohan Roy was not alone in holding these views; younger contemporaries of Rammohan proceeded even further. Almost all the evils from which the country was suffering were attributed to the Muslim rule. Thus Dwarkanath Tagore, by no means an orthodox Hindus, wrote in a letter to the *Englishman*, dated 6 December, 1838: "The present characteristic failings of natives are—a want of truth, a want of integrity, a want of independence. These were not the characteristics of former days, before the religion was corrupted and education had disappeared. It is to the Mahomedan conquest that these evils are owing, and they are the invariable results of the loss of liberty and national degradation. The Mahomedans introduced in this country all the vices of an ignorant, intolerant and licentious soldiery. The utter destruction of learning and science was an invariable part of their system, and the conquered, no longer able to protect their lives by arms and independence, fell into opposite extremes of abject submission, deceit and fraud. Such has been the condition of the Natives of Hindustan for centuries."[22] Dwaraka-nath Tagore also expressed his conviction that the happiness of India was best secured by her connection with England. Prasanna-kumar Tagore openly declared that he would prefer English government to any other, even to a Hindu government.[23]

The same sentiment is expressed in the Memorial to the Supreme Court against the Press Regulation, signed by Rammohan, Dwaraka-nath, Prasanna-kumar and three other prominent citizens of Calcutta. The following para may be quoted as a specimen.

"During the last wars which the British Government were obliged to undertake against neighbouring Powers it is well known that the great body of Natives of wealth and respectability, as well as the Landholders of consequence, offered up regular prayers to the objects of their worship for the success of the British arms from a deep conviction that under the sway of that nation, their improvement, both mental and social, would be promoted, and their lives, religion, and property be secured. Actuated by such feelings, even in those critical times, which are the best test of the loyalty of the subject, they voluntarily came forward with a large portion of their property to enable the British Government to carry into effect the measures necessary for its own defence, considering the cause of the British as their own, and firmly believing that on its success, their own happiness and prosperity depended."[23a]

It is interesting to note that this spirit was deliberately encouraged by the British to serve their own interests. Thus Reginald Heber, Lord Bishop of Calcutta, wrote on 1 March, 1824: "It is desirable that the Hindoos should always be reminded that we did not conquer them, but found them conquered, that their previous rulers were as much strangers to their blood and to their religion as we are, and that they were notoriously far more oppressive masters than we have ever shown ourselves."[23b]

But this anti-national and pro-British sentiment was by no means confined to the Bengali Hindus. The Marathas sought alliance with the English against the Nawab of Bengal in 1757. Shah Alam negotiated with Clive against Mir Jafar and the Vizier of Oudh (Awadh), and sent a *firman* to Holwell, offering a *carte blanche* to the British in Bengal provided they drew their forces off from Mir Jafar and bring them under his standard.[24] Even at the very end of the eighteenth century, when the danger of British domination over India should have been patent to all, the Marathas and the Nizam joined the British in exterminating the power of Tipu Sultan. There was no cohesion among the Maratha Chiefs, who fought with one another and could not take any concerted action against the British even in the war, waged by them at the beginning of the nineteenth century, which sealed their fate. It would be hardly any exaggeration to say that almost every Indian ruler bore grudge and intrigued against his neighbour and was ever ready to aggrandise himself at his cost, even with the help of the alien British, if need be. So far as the common people were concerned, their vision seldom extended beyond the narrow horizon of their own petty State. If they knew anything of other Indian peoples, they maintained supreme indifference, or even felt aversion, towards them. The Bengalis and the Rajputs remembered the horrors of the raid by the Marathas and cherished intense hatred against them. Similar feelings existed, for similar reasons, among other groups of Indian people. But even apart from such reasons, hardly any Indian ever regarded himself as a citizen of India owing allegiance to her, even as against any alien power. This is best evidenced by the fact that an Indian soldier was ready to fight against any Indian power, including his own province or State, on behalf of any other power, which was willing to pay him for his service. This enabled the British to conquer India with the help of the Indians themselves.

This statement holds good throughout the history of the British up to the end of the nineteenth century. It is on record that the Sepoys of Upper India, who under British leadership defeated the Sikhs, felt proud of their achievement and looked down upon them. The Sikhs reciprocated the sentiment and there was no love lost between the two. This difference was fully exploited by the British during the outbreak of 1857. If, as some Britishers proudly claim, they conquered India by the sword, it is only fair to remember that three-fourths of these swords were wielded by Indian hands.

In addition to the Hindus and Muslims, the English formed a distinct community in Bengal, particularly in Calcutta and neighbouring towns. Their numerical weakness was more than made up by the prestige attaching to the ruling community. Three classes could be distinguished among them, viz., officials, non-officials, and missionaries. In general, there was more familiar social intercourse between them and the Bengalis at the beginning than was the case after 1818. Sympathy with the political aspirations of the people was also more in evidence in the earlier period than in later years. This can be accounted for by two reasons. In the first place, the long journey to England before the opening of the Suez Canal made the Englishmen more reconciled to their abode in a foreign land. Being debarred from frequent intercourse and quick communication with home, and having no big society of their own in Calcutta, many of them turned to the society of Indians with a more friendly attitude than their successors. They imbibed many Bengali customs like smoking in a *hookah,* and took part in dances, music and religious festivals in Bengali homes.

Another cause which operated in the same direction was the fact that the English settlers had not yet,come to regard themselves as the ruling race. The political authority was vested in the East India Company, which was after all a private trading corporation and did not represent England as a whole. So there were many Englishmen who strongly criticised the Government and the officials, and some of them were deported by the Government out of India. As will be shown later, some Englishmen shared the political aspirations of the Indians and openly joined in their activities. On the whole, some of them seem to have taken a real and genuine interest in promoting the welfare of the people.

The official class was also generally sympathetic towards the Bengalis and mixed freely with them. Many officials were quite familiar with the languages and customs of the people and there was more friendly intercourse between the two than was the case later in the century.

The missionaries played a very large and important part in the life of Bengal. At first there were many restrictions to the immigration of English Christian Missionaries into India. But these were all removed by the Charter Act of 1813. Henceforth they came in large number and became an important feature of the society.

They were, generally speaking, more sympathetic towards the Indians than other classes of Europeans, and were noted for many beneficent activities to which reference will be made in connection with relevant topics. They were not, however, very scrupulous in regard to their proselytizing methods, nor restrained in their denunciation of Hindu religion. They created an ill-feeling towards them which is referred to in dignified language by Raja Rammohan Roy in his Preface to the *Brahmanical Magazine* (1821) from which the following extract is quoted: "But during the last twenty years, a body of English gentlemen, who are called missionaries, have been publicly endeavouring, in several ways, to convert Hindoos and Mussulmans of this country into Christianity. The first way is that of publishing and distributing among the natives various books, large and small, reviling both religions, and abusing and ridiculing the gods and saints of the former: the second way is that of standing in front of the doors of the natives or in the public roads to preach the excellency of their own religion and the debasedness of that of others: the third way is that if any natives of low origin become Christians from the desire of gain or from any other motives, these gentlemen employ and maintain them as a necessary encouragement to others to follow their example.

"It is true that the apostles of Jesus Christ used to preach the superiority of the Christian religion to the natives of different countries. But we must recollect that they were not of the rulers of those countries where they preached. Were the missionaries likewise to preach the Gospel and distribute books in countries not conquered by the English, such as Turkey, Persia, &c., which are much nearer England, they would be esteemed a body of men truly zealous in propagating religion and in following the example of the founders of Christianity. In Bengal, where the English are the sole rulers, and where the mere name of Englishman is sufficient to frighten people, an encroachment upon the rights of her poor timid and humble inhabitants and upon their religion, cannot be viewed in the eyes of God or the public as a justifiable act. For wise and good men always feel disinclined to hurt those that are of much less strength than themselves, and if such weak creatures be dependent on them and subject to their authority, they can never attempt, even in thought, to mortify their feelings".[24a]

On the whole, the Bengalis looked with favour upon the English community and many even looked forward to the colonization of Englishmen in this country on a large scale. There was a public movement, led by men like Rammohan Roy and Dwaraka-nath Tagore, to facilitate the permanent settlement of Englishmen in Bengal.[25]

Having given a general view of the different elements of the people of Bengal we may now try to form some idea of their intellectual and moral character as well as social and religious ideas. The memorandum of Raja Rammohan Roy, from which some questions and answers have been quoted above, also contains the following:

Q. What degree of intelligence exists among the native inhabitants?

A. The Mussulmans, as well as the more respectable classes of Hindus, chiefly cultivated Persian literature, a great

> number of the former and a few of the latter also extending their studies likewise to Arabic. This practice has partially continued to the present time, and among those who enjoy this species of learning, as well as among those who cultivate Sanskrit literature, many well-informed and enlightened persons may be found, though from their ignorance of European literature, they are not naturally much esteemed by such Europeans as are not well versed in Arabic or Sanskrit.[26]

On the whole, it would be hardly any exaggeration to say that higher education in Bengal, both among the Hindus and the Muslims, followed a stereotyped course during the half-millennium ending in A.D. 1800. Some special branches of Sanskrit literature such as *Navya-Nyāya*, *Smṛiti*, and grammar were more favourite subjects of study among the Hindus. But, in general, the trend and method of learning and its contents did not differ in any remarkable degree from that which prevailed at the time of Muslim conquest, save a growing interest in Persian, specially in North India. Similarly the Muslims confined their studies to Arabic and Persian. While many Hindus (probably more in number than Muslims) studied Persian, and a few even Arabic, the Muslims rarely cultivated Sanskrit. In addition to the traditional higher learning imparted in numerous *ṭols, chatushpāṭhis, maktabs* and *madrasas* through Sanskrit, Arabic and Persian, elementary education was provided in a number of Primary schools.

We may form a fairly accurate idea of the state of elementary education in Bengal at the beginning of the period under review from Mr. Adam's report,[27] based on a very detailed investigation of different localities throughout the province. It is not necessary to deal with it elaborately; it will suffice only to emphasize the following points:

1. Bengali was the medium of instruction. It was the "language of Mussalman as well as of the Hindu population" and though the "Hindustani or Urdu" was the current spoken language of the educated Mussalmans of Bengal and Bihar, it was never employed in the schools as the medium or instrument of written instruction.

2. The schools were most often held in some rooms in private houses and not unoften in the open. There were very few school houses built exclusively for this purpose, and they were mostly thatched cottages each of which, in addition to the personal labour of the pupils, was constructed at a cost averaging Rs. 1/4 to Rs. 10.

3. As regards the teachers, only a very few gave their instruc-

tions gratuitously because they had independent means of support. But, in general, the salary of the teachers was very poor. The average monthly professional income of the vernacular teachers of Bengal and Bihar was about Rs. 3/-, less than half of what was usually given in Calcutta to the lowest menials or domestic servants. The teachers, as could be expected, were mostly ignorant and absolutely unsuited for their task. They could hardly exercise any moral influence over their pupils.

4. The number of pupils was overwhelmingly Hindu. Whereas the Hindu population was to the Mussalman in the proportion of rather more than 2 to 1, the Hindu scholars enjoying the benefit of elementary indigenous education were to the Mussalman scholars in the proportion of about 19 to 1.

5. The subjects of instruction consisted mostly of reading, writing and some amount of arithmetic to enable the pupil to keep accounts. The students generally spent about six to seven years to learn these things. Some students continued beyond this for a period of two years. The accounts briefly and superficially taught in the preceding stage were now taught more thoroughly and at greater length, and these were accompanied by the composition of business letters, petitions, grants, leases, acceptances, notes or bonds etc. together with the forms of addresses appropriate to the different grades of rank and station.

6. The use of printed books was almost wholly unknown. In many old *thanas,* even manuscript text books were unknown. All that the scholars learnt was acquired from the oral dictation of the master. The literary texts mostly consisted of hymns addressed to different gods and goddesses, and stories, based on the epics, like *Ḍātākarṇa.*

7. The scheme of discipline may be truly characterized as a reign of terror. Kindness, patience, generosity, love,—all were alike unknown in the schools. Fear was the first and last and the only motive brought into play; punishment, the first and last and the only stimulant. Caning was the most normal, while open palm and clinched fist were also vigorously applied to the back, cheek and the head. Other ingenious modes of punishment were also followed. The school was regarded by the pupils as a sort of dungeon or grievous prison house to escape from which was the chiefest of all things and the desire to do so was the most powerful of all instincts.

8. The aggregate average number of the pupils for all the districts was less than eight per cent., and the aggregate average of

adult population who could read or write was no more than five and a half per cent.

9. As regards female education, it was practically unknown and there was no public institution for this purpose. There was a superstitious idea that a girl taught to read and write would soon after marriage become a widow. In the whole district of Murshidabad, Adam only found nine women who could read or write or who could merely decipher writing or sign their names. "In all the other localities of whch a census was taken, no adult females were found to possess even the lowest grade of instruction," a few probable exceptions being the daughters of *zamindars* or those belonging to some religious sects.

In addition to the elementary instruction given in regular schools, there was a kind of traditional knowledge of written language and accounts, preserved in families and passed on from father to son. Then, there were higher schools of Hindu and Muslim learning. In Hindu schools, studies were confined to general literature, law and logic. General literature consisted mainly of grammar, lexicology, poetry, drama and rhetoric. Grammar was the favourite study and, among other works, Pāṇini and *Kalāpa* received attention. In lexicology the *Amarakosha;* in verse the *Bhaṭṭi-Kāvya, Māgha-Kāvya* (on the war between Śiśupāla and Kṛishṇa), *Naishadha-Kāvya* (the love of Nala and Damayantī), the Śakuntalā episode etc.; in law Manu, the *Mitāksharā*, the *Dāyabhāga* and the *Dattakamīmāṃsā* and the treatises of Raghunandana; in logic Māthurī commentary of *Vyāpti-Pañchaka* and in mythology, *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* or other works of the same class appear to have been in wide use and were frequently quoted.

William Adam thought that in his time probably the Alaṅkāra Śāstras and Tantras were more generally studied. The Committee of Public Instruction noted that the chief study at Nadia was Nyāya (logic). The Brahmans showed skill in astronomy, constructed almanacs and calculated eclipses. To the philosophical theology of the Vedas, the ritual of modern Hinduism, and astrology, was added medicine (of the Ayurveda system). An old woman in Purneah had become well known for extracting stones from the bladder, an operation which she performed after the manner of the ancients. In certain districts were found several scholars of keen and versatile intellect, adepts in the subtleties of grammar and skilled in its practical uses. In the district of Burdwan was found a scholar, by name Raghunandana, who had written no less than 37 books, including treatises on prosody, a compilation from works on the treatment of diseases, commentaries on ancient law-givers, a life of Rāma and a eulogy on the Raja of Burdwan. A scholar of Hindu learning was normally a grammarian, who was absorbed in the meaning of words and their forms, competent to interpret ancient authorities, able to appreciate the logicalities and fine distinctions of ancient learning, and who invariably indulged in disputations. Many of these scholars lived very simple lives and were perfect examples of plain living and high thinking. Students from remote parts of India gathered at Nadia (Bengal); they spoke Sanskrit, the language of the cultivated intellect all over India, with great fluency.

Muslim learning was of two types, Persian and Arabic. Studies pursued in Persian were forms of correspondence, legal processes and legendary tales. The didactic and poetical works of Saadi (*Gulistan* and *Bostan*), the letters of Abul Fazl, the *Pandenamath, Sikandarnamah* and other poetical works, like *Yusuf and Zulekha, Bahar Danish, Laila and Majnun,* were read. At Rajshahi, the Persian course commenced with *'alif be'* and proceeded to the formal reading of the Qur'ān. At Murshidabad poems of Urfi, Hafiz, etc., the law of inheritance, the fundamentals of Islam, the unity of God, and natural philosophy were studied. Works produced in Persian comprised treatises on theology and medicine. Arabic studies, which were preceded by a course of Persian reading, were confined to grammar, logic, law (especially of inheritance) and religion, and included Euclid's geometry, Ptolemy's astronomy and some mutilated extracts from the writings of Aristotle and Plato. Among other aspects, grammar covered *Munshaib* (Etymology), *Mizan* (Prosody), *Zubda* (Permutation), and *Tasrif* (Inflection).

The most notable development in the intellectual field during the Muslim rule was the rise of Bengali language and literature. From its doubtful beginnings in the tenth or eleventh century A.D., it had developed into a rich literature by A.D. 1800. The Muslims also cultivated it and we know the names of a few well-known texts composed by them. But the Bengali literature of A.D. 1800 was mainly religious in character. All the books were written in poetry and the prose style was hardly developed at all. Excepting a few letters, business documents and missionary texts of the nature of catechism, we have no specimens of Bengali prose written before A.D. 1800 The first attempt to evolve a prose style was made at the beginning of the nineteenth century A.D. by the teachers of the Fort William College and Raja Rammohan Roy.[27a] But Bengali prose had not yet grown up as a suitable vehicle of literary expression on any matter, religious or secular. This point must be borne in mind when we think of the wonderful outburst of literary activity in Bengali prose during the nineteenth century. The progress which

Bengali prose made, alike in style and contents, in course of a single century, has probably had few parallels in the history of the world.

The influence of Arabic and Persian upon the development of Bengali literature during the six hundred years of Muslim rule has been much exaggerated. Although Bengali vocabulary has been much enriched by loan-words, the Bengali literature bears no definite imprint of the spirit of either Arabic or Persian literature. Nor have Muslim traditions or beliefs exercised much influence on it. It bears the distinct stamp of Hindu religion and mythology, and is profoundly moulded by Sanskrit literature, in spite of occasional or very casual references to Pirs, Paygambar or isolated Muslim creeds. On the whole, the Bengali literature was far more powerfully affected by western influence during the nineteenth century than by the Muslim influence during the six hundred years that preceded it.

The same thing may be said of the social and religious institutions. The general framework of the Hindu society and religion in A.D. 1200 did not undergo any radical change during the six hundred years that followed. The Hindus at the beginning of the nineteenth century exhibited the same fundamental characteristics as in the thirteenth. A deep-rooted belief in a number of gods and goddesses, universal practice of image worship, a rigid caste system with its attendant restrictions about touch, food, and marriage, child-marriage and the strict prohibition of the remarriage of widows, preference, among high-class Hindus, of vegetarian diet, and horror of beef-eating, indicate in no uncertain manner how Islam had failed to touch even the fringe of Hindu society. This was underlined especially by the untouchability and the old iniquitous attitude towards the lower castes which afforded a striking contrast to the social equality of the people in Muslim community.

So far as the Hindu masses were concerned, religion meant only an unending series of rituals and ceremonies, performed in strict accordance with scriptural rules. Many obnoxious rites were practised by the common people, and immoral customs, with belief in witchcraft and sorcery, were in vogue. These were, at least partly, legacies of Tantric beliefs and practices which had a strong hold in Bengal. Religion, as a source of moral purity and spiritual force, exercised little influence over a large section of the common people.

There was undoubtedly a general deterioration in Hindu society. Long subjection to alien rule, lack of contact wth the progressive forces of the world, and a stereotyped system of education leading to knowledge which was based upon blind faith impervious to reason,—

all these told upon the mental and moral outlook of men and society. Nothing so forcibly illustrates the degrading character of the age as its callousness to women. It was seriously debated in Bengali periodicals throughout the first half of the nineteenth century whether the Hindu scriptures were in favour of, or against, female education. The custom of *Sati* or burning of a widow along with the body of her dead husband is well known. In Calcutta and its neighbourhood alone there were 253, 289 and 441 cases of *Sati*, respectively, in 1815, 1816 and 1817.[28] Not only was it tolerated by all classes of people, but when the practice was forbidden by law, a largely signed petition was presented to the Government against it. The signatories numbered 1146 including 120 Pandits and many prominent leaders of Hindu society in Bengal. A number of letters also appeared in the newspapers in support of the abominable practice. It seems as if there was a paralysis of moral sensibilities and utter lack of humane feelings among the Hindus, or at least a large section of them.

Another social evil was the marriage of Kulin Brahmans. Owing to old conventions a few Brahman families in Bengal were regarded as superior in respect of social prestige and obtained high dowries in marriage market. The result was that these Brahmans married a large number of wives, sometimes as many as fifty or sixty, or even more. These wives lived in their fathers' houses and many of them scarcely saw their husbands after their marriage. The evil was heightened by the fact that many girls, according to social usage, could be married only to Kulins and therefore had to remain unmarried until death. Cases were not rare when a number of such girls, varying in age from 20 to 50, were all married to a single old man, at one sitting, just to remove their maidenhood, which was considered a disgrace. It is hardly necessary to point out the great moral evils resulting from this practice, but it was tolerated in spite of protests and did not disappear till quite late in the century.

Callousness to human sufferings, arising out of blind adherence to old practices, seems to have been the order of the day. The number of cruel practices associated with *charaka-pūjā* (Hook-swinging) furnish another illustration. Men were tied to a rope attached to a wheel and rapidly whirled round, while in some cases, iron pikes or arrows were inserted into the back, legs or other parts of their bodies. Sometimes the rope snapped and the body was thrown to a distance of 25 to 30 yards, reduced to a shapeless mass. In all cases the men were all but dead when brought down from the wheel.

As regards the Muslims, it will appear from the evidence of Raja Rammohan Roy, quoted above, that in some respects, their middle class was superior to the Hindus. But the upper class or aristocracy was rotten to the core, and the masses were poor and ignorant. Referring to the beginning of the British rule the eminent historian Jadu-nath Sarkar observes: "When Clive struck at the Nawab, Mughal civilization had become a spent bullet. Its potency for good, its very life was gone. The country's administration had become hopelessly dishonest and inefficient, and the mass of the people had been reduced to the deepest poverty; ignorance and moral degradation by a small, selfish, proud, and unworthy ruling class. Imbecile lechers filled the throne, the family of Alivardy did not produce a single son worthy to be called a man, and the women were even worse than the men. Sadists like Siraj and Miran made even their highest subjects live in constant terror. The army was rotten and honey-combed with treason. The purity of domestic life was threatened by the debauchery fashionable in the Court and the aristocracy and the sensual literature that grew up under such patrons. Religion had become the handmaid of vice and folly."[29]

About the general character of the Bengali people, widely different views have been expressed by contemporary Englishmen. Warren Hastings wrote in 1784 that "a few years ago most of the Englishmen regarded the Indians almost as barbarians, and though the feeling has decreased it has not entirely disappeared." The truth of this statement is proved by a book written in 1792 by Charles Grant, an officer of the Company, in which the Bengalis are painted in the blackest colour, and are described as 'inferior to the most backward classes in Europe. Dishonesty and corruption were rampant, specially in law courts, and the people were selfish and devoid of conscience. Patriotism was a thing unknown to them'.[30] About the same time Lord Cornwallis, the Governor-General, said: "Every native of Hindustan, I verily believe, is corrupt."[31] Macaulay's famous diatribe against the Bengali character, of which perjury and forgery are said to have formed as integral a part as the horn of the rhinoceros and the beauty of a Greek woman, has become classical.

Many others have written in the same strain. But more charitable views are also not wanting. Bishop Heber, who travelled over the whole of Northern India in 1824-5, has recorded his impression of Indian character in various places in his diary and letters. He was more intimately acquainted with Bengal, as he was the Lord Bishop of Calcutta. His earliest reference to the Bengalis is in the following terms: "I have, indeed, understood from many quarters, that the Bengalees are regarded as the greatest cowards in India; and that partly owing to this reputation, and partly to their inferior size, the Sepoy regiments are always recruited from Bihar and other provinces."[32] Elsewhere he says: "The term Bengalee is used to express anything which is roguish and cowardly; such as they are, however, I am far from disliking them."[33] Heber, however, notes that the general view that the Hindus were gentle and timid "is doubtless, to a certain extent, true of the Bengalees," but the people of Upper India, "despising rice and rice-eaters, feeding on wheat and barley bread", were decidedly of martial character and "equal in stature and strength to the average of European nations."[34] Heber entertained a very favourable view of the Hindus in general. "I do not," says he, "by any means assent to pictures of depravity and general worthlessness which some have drawn of the Hindoos."[35] ..."On the whole they are a lively, intelligent, and interesting people: of the upper classes, a very considerable proportion learn our language, read our books and our newspapers, and shew a desire to court our society; the peasants are anxious to learn English."[36] "They are men of high and gallant courage, courteous, intelligent, and most eager after knowledge and improvement with a remarkable aptitude for the abstract sciences, geometry, astronomy, &c. and for the imitative arts, painting and sculpture. They are sober, industrious, dutiful to their parents, and affectionate to their children, of tempers almost uniformly gentle and patient."[37] At the same time Heber refers to many of their vices "arising from slavery, from an unsettled state of society, and immoral and erroneous systems of religion."[38] But he pays a great tribute to the character and attainments of the Indians. A few lines may be quoted from a long passage: "But to say that the Hindoos or Mussulmans are deficient in any essential feature of a civilized people, is an assertion which I can scarcely suppose to be made by any who have lived with them. Their manners are, at least, as pleasing and courteous as those in the corresponding stations of life among ourselves...Nor is it true that in the mechanical arts they are inferior to the general run of European nations...Their goldsmiths and weavers produce as beautiful fabrics as our own...they shew an anxiety to imitate our models, and do imitate them very successfully. The ships built by native artists at Bombay are notoriously as good as any which sail from London or Liverpool. The carriages and gigs which they supply at Calcutta are as handsome, though not as durable, as those of Long Acre. In Monghyr I had pistols, double-barrelled guns,... which in outward form nobody but perhaps Mr....could detect to be of Hindoo origin."[39]

Reverend James Long makes the following observations in respect of Bishop Heber:

"He was far from adopting a notion then prevalent that the whole of the Hindus were a kind of moral monsters. Ward's account of the Hindus has contributed to foster this view. Many of Mr. Ward's remarks respecting the cruelties and immoralities among the Hindus are no more applicable to the body of the people than a description of Billingsgate and the Old Bailey in London would be to the inhabitants of the west end of the town. Bishop Heber makes the following remarks on this subject:

'They are a nation, with whom whatever their faults, I, for one, shall think it impossible to live long without loving them—a race of gentle and temperate habits, with a natural talent and acuteness beyond the ordinary level of mankind, and with a thirst of general knowledge which even the renowned and the inquisitive Athenians can hardly have surpassed or equalled."[40]

Subsequent history has fully vindicated the penetrating insight of Bishop Heber into the character of the Indians including the Bengali people. Perhaps a fairer estimate was formed by Raja Rammohan Roy. In his statement before the Select Committee of the House of Commons in 1831, he gave the following answer to the question—What is the moral condition of the people?

"From a careful survey and observation of the people and inhabitants of various parts of the country, and in every condition of life, I am of opinion that the peasants and villagers who *reside at a distance from large towns and head stations and courts of law,* are as innocent, temperate and moral in their conduct as the people of any country whatsoever; and the further I proceed towards the North and West, the greater the honesty, simplicity and independence of character I meet with....2ndly, The inhabitants of the cities, towns or stations who have much intercourse with persons employed about the courts of law, by Zamindars, etc., and with foreigners and others in a different state of civilization, generally imbibe their habits and opinion. Hence their religious opinions are shaken without any other principles being implanted to supply their place. Consequently a great proportion of these are far inferior in point of character to the former class, and are very often even made tools of in the nefarious work of perjury and forgery; 3rdly, A third class consists of persons who are in the employ of landholders (Zamindars) or dependent for subsistence on the courts of law, as attorney's clerks, and who must rely for a livelihood on their shrewdness; not having generally sufficient means to enter into commerce and business. These are for the most part still worse than the second class; more especially when they have no prospect of bettering their condition by the savings of honest industry, and no hope is held out to them of rising to honour or affluence by superior merit. But I must confess that I have met a great number of the second class engaged in a respectable line of trade, who were men of real merit, worth and character. Even among the third class I have known many who had every disposition to act uprightly and some actually honest in their conduct. And if they saw by experience that their merits were appreciated, that they might hope to gain an independence by honest means, and that just and honourable conduct afforded the best prospect of their being ultimately rewarded by situations of trust and respectability, they would gradually begin to feel a high regard for character and rectitude of conduct; and from cherishing such feelings become more and more worthy of public confidence, while their example would powerfully operate on the second class above noticed, which is generally dependent on them and under their influence".[41]

But whatever we might think of these views, the facts so far known seem to indicate that the moral character and cultural life of the Bengalis, at least in certain respects, had reached a very low ebb indeed. The life in the capital city may be taken as a fair index of the character of at least that section of the people which guides their destiny. So far as can be gleaned from contemporary literature and such other evidence as we possess, the moral life of Calcutta was very low according to our present standard. Wine, women, and duel were the chief diversions of the small European community. The rich Bengalis did not lag behind, and spent their time in a round of joyous festivities throughout the year. The dancing girls formed the chief attraction in many religious ceremonies and social functions, and Europeans and Indians alike,—both high and low, from the Governor-General and Raja Rammohan Roy to the men in the street—felt no scruple in enjoying in public the charms and arts of the youthful beauties. Sexual immorality was rampant among all classes, particularly the wealthy section. Wine and women formed the principal items of their merriment with occasional breaks caused by vulgar types of dramatic performances and poets' contests and such innocuous but costly frivolities as the marriage of dolls, bird-fighting, kite-flying and rain-gambling. Huge sums were spent on the occasion of the Durgā Pujā, the national festival in Bengal, and such socio-religious ceremonies like marriage and *śrāddha*.

The social relation between the Europeans and the Indians was already marked by those symptoms which made it worse and worse with the progress of the nineteenth century. Heber writes: "Neither the civil nor military officers have much intercourse with the natives, though between officers and magistrates of a certain rank, and the natives of distinction, there is generally an occasional interchange of visits and civilities".[42] Heber refers to the "distance and haughtiness with which a very large proportion of the civil and military servants of the Company treat the upper and middling class of natives." He observes that the French, under Perron and De Boigne, had a great advantage over the British in this respect, "and the easy and friendly intercourse in which they (French) lived with natives of rank, is still often regretted in Agra and the Dooab". "This is not all", continues Heber. "The foolish pride of the English absolutely leads them to set at nought the injunctions of their own Government." He points out that under the standing orders of the Council and of the Army the Tahsildars and Subahdars should have always chairs offered them in the presence of their European superiors. "Yet there are hardly six Collectors in India who observe the former etiquette; and the latter, which was fifteen years ago never omitted in the army, is now completely in disuse". Heber remarks that the Tahsildars and Subahdars know the regulations and feel themselves aggrieved every time these civilities are neglected, and men of old families are kept out of their former situation by this and other similar slights."[43]

The racial arrogance and exclusiveness had one good effect. Connection with native women was very common at the beginning of the nineteenth century, but when Heber wrote (1824), it ceased to be a fashionable vice among the younger servants, either civil or military, of the Company.[44] One of these had the hardihood to remark that he was repelled by the obnoxious odour of the native women's body.[45]

It is, however, apparent that the Englishmen were affected by the ideas of oriental pomp and grandeur, almost as much as the Indians were attracted by British fashions. Heber observes: "The state in which the high officers of Government appear, and the sort of deference paid to them in society are great, and said to be necessary in conformity with native ideas and example set by the first conquerors, who took their tone from the Mussulmans whom they supplanted. All members of Council, and others, down to the rank of Puisne Judges inclusive, are preceded by two men with silver-sticks, and two others with heavy silver-maces."[46]

Similarly Heber tells us that "at present there is an obvious and increasing disposition" on the part of the Indians "to imitate the English in everything".[47] Referring to the wealthy natives of Bengal, Heber says: "None of them adopt our dress...But their houses are adorned with verandahs and Corinthian pillars; they have very handsome carriages, often built in England; they speak tolerable English, and they shew a considerable liking for European society, where (which unfortunately is not always the case) they are encouraged or permitted to frequent it on terms of anything like equality".[48] Referring to a country-house of the Tagore family, Heber comments: "This is more like an Italian villa, than what one should have expected as the residence of Hurree Mohun Thakoor. Nor are his carriages, the furniture of his house, or the style of his conversation, of a character less decidedly European."[49] "Among the lower orders the same feeling shews itself more beneficially in a growing neglect of caste—in not merely a willingness, but an anxiety, to send their children to our schools, and a desire to learn and speak English".[50]

The horizon of the Bengalis, like the peoples of the other parts of India, was limited by the frontiers of their own Province, and they felt no concern for the rest of the country. An armed robbery in the Dhurrumtollah street excited greater interest in Calcutta than the battles of Assye and Argaon in 1803. As noted above, every successive British victory over an Indian State served as an occasion of thanksgiving to the Divine Providence for the success of the British arms, from which the Bengalis derived a sort of vicarious glory. But the Bengalis were by no means more culpable in this respect than others. Writing in 1824, Heber says that the Bengalis were regarded by the Hindostanees as no less foreigners than the English.[51] This parochial spirit was due mainly to historical traditions and the difficulties of communication between different parts of India. The devastations caused by the Marathas all over Hindusthan, particularly in Bengal and Rajputana, within living memory, made them odious to the inhabitants of these regions, and the dread of the Bargis (Maratha soldiers) supplied theme to lullaby songs in Bengal.

The problem of communication was also no less important. To an Indian of the twentieth century it would require an effort to visualize the mode of journey from Bengal to Delhi, Madras or Bombay. Men had to negotiate these long distances through a difficult terrain full of dangers from wild animals and still more ferocious Pindaris, Thugs or other classes of robbers. Except where boats could ply, one had to walk or use a bullock-cart, horses and other carriages being too costly for an ordinary man. Except for pilgrimage or urgent business, journeys to distant lands were very uncommon. Then there was the difficulty of languages. Neither Hindī nor Urdu could serve as a *lingua franca* in a considerable part of India, and Persian was no longer as popular in the nineteenth as it was in the eighteenth century. The whole country was divided into a very large number of self-contained units, almost mutually exclusive in character, and the conception of India as a common motherland was still in the realm of fancy. There was no India as it is understood today. There were Bengalis, Hindusthanis, Marathas, Sikhs, etc., but no Indians, at the beginning of the nineteenth century. There was, however, a complete revolution of ideas at the end of that century. One who speaks of an Indian nation at the beginning of the nineteenth century does as much violence to historical facts as those who refuse to recognize it at the end of that century.

---

1. *HBS*, 498.
2. S.C. Hill, *Bengal in 1756-7*, III. 328.
3. K. K. Dutt, *Bengal Subah*, I, 102-06.
4. Basu—I, 96.
5. Seeley, *Expansion of England* (1904), p. 236. The words within bracket are not in the original.

5a. Rammohan—*Works*, 476.

6. Ibid, 465.
7. Ibid, 146.
8. Ibid, 224.
9. *Rammohan Centenary Volume*, 33.
10. Rammohan—*Works*, pp. 245, 295.
11. Banerji, B.N., III. 217.
12. Bagal—I, 174 ff.
13. Vol. VI, pp. 615 ff.
14. Ibid, f.n., 1a.
15. "The people of this country are divided into Hindus and Musalmans" (Translation of a Bengali passage in the *Amritabazar Patrika* dated 12 August, 1869. Quoted in Bagal—I, 174.)
16. English translation published by R. Cambray & Co., III. 188-9.
17. Bagal—I. 176.

17a. R. C. Majumdar, *History of the Freedom Movement in India*, Vol. III, p. 573.

18. Rammohan—*Works*, 439.
19. Ibid, 462.
20. Ibid, 445-6.
21. Ibid, 874.
22. Kishorichand Mitra, *Memoir of Dwarkanath Tagore*, p. 60.
23. Majumdar, B., 187.

23a. Rammohan—*Works*, 439.

23b. Heber, I. 89.

24. These will be fully discussed in Vol. VIII with full references. Cf. Vansittart, *Narrative*, I. 51; Scrafton, *Reflections*, 82-3, 119, 124; Malleson, *Clive*, 299; Verelst, *A view of the Rise, Progress and Present State of the English Government in Bengal*, p. 46, f.n.

24a. Rammohan—*Works*, 145-6.

25. The idea was not, however, favourably received by many. Majumdar, B., 72 ff., 93 ff., 194-5.
26. *Rammohan Centenary Volume*, 81.
27. Adam, W., *Reports on Vernacular Education* etc.

27a. These will be discussed in detail in Vol. VIII.

28. This will be discussed in detail in Chapter XLV.
29. *HBS*, 497.
30. Bengal—II, 3.
31. Spear, 137.
32. Heber, I. 85.
33. Heber, III. 316.
34. Ibid, 348.
35. Ibid, 253-4.

36. Ibid, 261.
37. Ibid, 333, 389.
38. Ibid, 333.
39. Ibid, 351-2.
40. Long, J, *Handbook of Bengal Missions*, p. 40 footnote.
41. Rammohan—*Works*, 296-7.
42. Heber, III. 335.
43. Ibid, 337-8.
44. Ibid, 373.
45. Chailley, J., *Administrative Problems of British India*, p. 195.
46. Heber, III. 228.
47. Ibid, 252.
48. Ibid, 232.
49. Ibid, 234.
50. Ibid, 252.
51. Heber, I. 440.

CHAPTER II (XL)

ENGLISH EDUCATION

I. BEGINNINGS OF ENGLISH EDUCATION IN BENGAL UP TO 1835.

If we have to choose one single factor which helped more than others in bringing about the great transformation in India in the nineteenth century, we can, without any hesitation, point to the introduction of English education. The English education, and the Western ideas which flowed along with it, formed the foundation of all the wonderful progress that we witness in Bengal during the British rule.

Exigencies of administration and commercial intercourse forced the Indians, particularly the residents of Calcutta, Bombay, and Madras to cultivate the knowledge of English in the eighteenth century, or even earlier. But English was neither spoken nor understood by the Indians to any larger extent till the close of the eighteenth century. Even in Bengal where the British wielded the political power, there was no regular arrangement for teaching English to the Indians. There is evidence, however, that some Indian ruling chiefs at the close of the eighteenth century had fair knowledge of English. Heber says that Nawab Sadat Ali of Avadh spoke English like a native and Nawab Shamsudaula of Dacca, whom he met, "speaks and writes English very tolerably, and even fancies himself a critic in Shakespeare".[1] But with the opening of the nineteenth century there was a growing appreciation of the value of English as a medium of culture on the part of the educated Bengalis, specially the Hindus. The more they came into contact with the educated English people the more they understood the nature and importance of their distinctive culture and realized the necessity of imbibing its spirit through the knowledge of English. Schools for teaching English were accordingly founded in Calcutta and its neighbourhood. A school was established at Bhawanipore, a suburb of Calcutta, in A.D. 1800, and another in 1814 at Chinsura by its Magistrate, Mr. Forbes. It is not, however, till the year 1817 that we find a concerted attempt for the diffusion of English education in Bengal, particularly in Calcutta and its immediate neighbourhood. Two notable institutions which did yeoman's work in this direction were—1. Calcutta School Book Society,[2] and 2. Hindu College, both founded in 1817. The object of the former was to make available good text-books, both in English and in Indian languages, suitable for schools. The Society undertook to prepare such text-books and to print and publish them. They were sold at a cheap price and sometimes distributed free. The publication of religious books was beyond its purview.

Soon after the establishment of this Society, the members of the Committee felt the need of good schools for teaching English. As a result of their efforts, a meeting was held for this purpose in the Town Hall of Calcutta on 1st September, 1818. It was resolved in this meeting to establish a separate society named the Calcutta School Society. Its object was defined to be to help and improve the schools already existing in Calcutta and to establish new schools according to need. It was also one of its objectives to establish higher educational institutions where the students passing from the existing schools could continue more advanced studies and thus make themselves suitable as teachers for its schools. David Hare was a member and European Secretary, and Raja Radha-kanta Dev was the Indian Secretary of the Society.

But by far the most important institution that helped the spread of English education in Bengal was the Hindu College, established in Calcutta on January 20, 1817. As there is a great deal of misconception regarding the foundation of this college, it is necessary to refer briefly to the circumstances which led to it as authenticated by contemporary documents.[3] It appears that about the beginning of May, 1816, a Brahmin of Calcutta saw Sir Hyde East, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Calcutta, and informed him that many of the leading Hindus were desirous of forming an establishment for the education of their children in a liberal manner as practised by Europeans, and desired him to hold a meeting for this purpose. Accordingly Sir Hyde East, with the permission of the Governor-General and the Supreme Council, called a meeting at his house on 14th May, 1816, at which fifty and upwards of the most respectable Hindu inhabitants of rank or wealth attended, including also the principal Pandits, when a sum of nearly half-a-lakh of Rupees was subscribed and many more subscriptions were promised.

The above account is taken almost verbatim from a letter, dated 18th May, 1816, written by Sir Hyde East to his friend, Mr. J. Harrington, a brother-judge, then in England. The Brahmin who first suggested to him about the Institution is not named in the letter, but Sir Hyde East says that he knew him. It has been generally supposed that this person is no other than Raja Rammohan Roy, and consequently he has been regarded as the founder or promoter of the Hindu College. This view is, however, certainly wrong, for later in the same letter Sri Hyde East categorically says that he did not know Raja Rammohan Roy. The Brahmin who saw Sir Hyde East seems to be no other than Baidyanath Mukherjee, a well-known citizen of Calcutta at that time.

The meeting decided to establish a college, housed in its own building, with the object of teaching Bengali, Hindustani and English languages; and then Persian, if desired; arithmetic, history, geography, astronomy, mathematics; and in time, as the fund increases, English belles-lettres, poetry, etc. Stress was also to be laid on teaching the English system of morals.

Sir Hyde East observes: "One of the singularities of the meeting was that it was composed of persons of various castes, all combining for such a purpose, whom nothing else could have brought together; whose children are to be taught, though not fed, together.

"Another singularity was, that the most distinguished Pandits who attended declared their warm approbation of all the objects proposed; and when they were about to depart, the head Pandit, in the name of himself and the others, said that they rejoiced in having lived to see the day when literature (many parts of which had formerly been cultivated in their country with considerable success, but which were now nearly extinct) was about to be revived with greater lustre and prospect of success than ever."

Any one who goes through the newspapers of the period cannot fail to be struck with the genuine enthusiasm which the foundation of these schools evoked in the mind of the public, and a sincere desire to multiply their number in order to meet a keenly felt need for liberal education. There were no less than twenty-five such schools in Calcutta alone before 1835, when the Government ultimately decided to extend its patronage to English education. Large numbers of such institutions were also founded outside Calcutta. Macaulay, writing in 1836, stated that he had found in one town alone, in Bengal, 1400 boys learning English.[4]

"The excitement," Duff wrote at the time, "for Western education continued unabated. They pursued us along the streets; they threw open the doors of our palankeens; they poured in their supplications with a pitiful earnestness of countenance which might have softened a heart of stone".[5]

The institutions were all founded by private efforts, and both Englishmen and Indians co-operated in this work.

The Christian missionaries founded the Baptist Mission College at Serampore in 1818. They also founded several schools, one of which was named after Rev. Duff, and its expenses were met out of endowments for Scottish Churches. Some schools were founded by private individuals, both Indian and European. David Hare, Raja Rammohan Roy and G. A. Turnbull each founded a school. The Lord Bishop of Calcutta established a college in 1820. The Oriental Seminary was founded in 1828 by Gaurmohan Auddy.

The students of the Hindu College took a leading part in establishing new schools, and in 1831 there were six morning schools in different parts of Calcutta, founded and managed by them.

There are occasional references to various subjects taught in these schools. These included, besides a knowledge of English literature and grammar, mathematics, astronomy, geography, chemistry (both theoretical and practical), philosophy (both Indian and European), history (ancient and modern), painting, handwriting and various arts and crafts.

II. AIMS AND OBJECTS OF ENGLISH EDUCATION

There is a general impression in India that the English education was introduced by the British rulers for their administrative convenience and the course was deliberately designed to make the Indians only fit for clerks. There appears to be little justification for this view.

As will be shown in the next section, the Government did not encourage English education, far less took any active part in promoting it, till nearly twenty years after the foundation of the Hindu College. But before turning to that topic, it is necessary to get a clear idea of the aims and objects with which English education was promoted by non-Government agencies.

The most lucid exposition of the liberal ideas which lay at the root of the demand for English education is to be found in a letter which Raja Rammohan Roy wrote in December, 1823, and forwarded to Lord Amherst, the Governor-General, through R. Heber, Lord Bishop of Calcutta.[6] It contains a strong protest against the Government proposal to establish a Sanskrit school under Hindu Pandits. Rammohan exposes the uselessness of such an institution in the following words:

"This seminary (similar in character to those which existed in Europe before the time of Lord Bacon) can only be expected to lead the minds of the youth with grammatical niceties and metaphysical distinctions of little or no practical use to the possessors or to society. The pupils will there acquire what was known two thousand years ago with the addition of vain and empty subtleties since then produced by speculative men, such as is already commonly taught in all parts of India".[7] He points out at length how the young students of this seminary would merely waste a dozen years of the most valuable period of their lives by acquiring the niceties of Sanskrit grammar, speculative philosophy of Vedānta, obsolete interpretations of Vedic passages in Mīmāṁsā, and the subtleties of the Nyāya Śāstra. He then continues:

"In order to enable your Lordship to appreciate the utility of encouraging such imaginary learning as above characterized, I beg your Lordship will be pleased to compare the state of science and literature in Europe before the time of Lord Bacon with the progress of knowledge made since he wrote.

"If it had been intended to keep the British nation in ignorance of real knowledge, the Baconian philosophy would not have been allowed to displace the system of the schoolmen which was the best calculated to perpetuate ignorance. In the same manner the Sanskrit system of education would be the best calculated to keep this country in darkness, if such had been the policy of the British legislature. But as the improvement of the native population is the object of the Government, it will consequently promote a more liberal and enlightened system of instruction, embracing Mathematics, Natural Philosophy, Chemistry, Anatomy, with other useful sciences, which may be accomplished with the sums proposed by employing a few gentlemen of talent and learning educated in Europe and providing a College furnished with necessary books, instruments and other apparatus".[8]

In this letter the Raja gave a very forceful expression to the view which was held by a large number of Indians and Europeans both before and after him. This is proved not only by the large number of schools, referred to above, which were designed to meet this need, but also by similar views expressed in contemporary periodicals. Reference may be made in this connection to an article, published in a Bengali journal named *Sudhākar* on 7 September, 1833. Its leading ideas may be summed up as follows: 'The Government pays no heed to the newspaper articles on the spread of education. It no doubt spends a lakh of Rupees on education through Education Society, but we are at a loss to understand the benefits accruing from it. The amount spent on Sanskrit College or School is of no benefit to the people in general, for only Brahman students are admitted there. Besides, institutions for teaching Sanskrit were never wanting in this country, and Sanskrit education would not have suffered much even if Government had not extended its patronage to it. It is further to be remembered that Sanskrit learning only enables a man to prescribe Sastric rules, and serves no other useful purpose. Therefore the Government should sow the seeds, all over the country, of that type of learning which can remove the darkness of ignorance and makes a man fit for administration and other public activities. It is necessary to establish an English school for this purpose in every village. This would involve a huge cost and to meet this we suggest that the Government orders each villager to pay a subscription according to his ability ranging from one to four annas. The balance may be met out of the funds placed at the disposal of the Education Society'.[9]

This article puts in a nutshell the view prevailing among the Indians regarding the nature and object of the English education they had in view. It was primarily intended to be a liberal education which would "remove the darkness of ignorance," but was also looked upon as a means to enable one to take part in the administration of the country and public activities for the benefit of the people.

Although there is no basis, therefore, for the contention that the English education was introduced by the British rulers with the sole object of turning out clerks, it must be noted that different sections desired it from different points of view. The twofold objects which the enlightened Hindus had in view were liberal education and participation in administration, as noted above. The Christian missionaries regarded the liberal education imparted through English schools as the most fruitful means for the conversion of Indians to Christianity by making them conscious of their superstitions. As one of them put it in the *Calcutta Journal* of March 11, 1822, Indians "now engaged in the degrading and polluting worship of idols shall be brought to the knowledge of the true God and Jesus Christ whom He has sent." But this view was by no means confined to the missionaries. Macaulay himself wrote to his father: "It is my firm belief that if our plans of education are followed up, there will not be a single idolater among the respectable classes in Bengal thirty years hence. And this will be effected without efforts to proselytize; without the smallest interference with religious liberty; merely by the natural operation of knowledge and reflection." David Hare also expressed similar views.

It is interesting to note that similar hopes were entertained even by a section of the Indians. In this connection attention may be drawn to a remarkable letter written on 8 October, 1831, by Madhab-chandra Mallik, a teacher of the Hindu Free School. He categorically states that the object of the institution is to impart that kind of knowledge which is calculated to make man fit for public life and remove darkness of ignorance, particularly religious prejudices and superstitions. "If", says he, "we intended to perpetuate the irrational religious ideas that have fettered our mind for such a long time, we would never have established the Hindu Free School".[10]

Another probable effect anticipated from the education imparted in these English schools was the growth of ideas of liberty and freedom from British yoke. Macaulay's famous speech on this subject in the House of Commons is well-known to everybody. He thought that "having become instructed in European language, they (Indian) may, in some future age, demand European institutions", and concluded by saying that "whenever it comes, it will be the proudest day in English history." But similar sentiment was expressed by others, too. Reference may be made in this connection to the evidence given before the Select Committee of the House of Commons by Major-General Lionel Smith, K. C. B., on October 6, 1831. He was emphatically of opinion that the Western education would make them "feel the value of governing themselves", and therefore "the effect of imparting education will be to turn us out of the country." But he would not regret it, for "America has been of more value to us separate than as a colony." Mountstuart Elphinstone held the same view. "Lt. General Briggs, visiting his camp one day and observing in his tent a pile of printed Marathi books, asked what they were for. 'To educate the native,' said Elphinstone, 'but it is our highroad back to Europe".[11]

On the other hand, diametrically opposite views were entertained by others who believed that the English education was the only means of reconciling the Indians to the British rule. These were forcefully explained by Trevelyan, in the following statement before the Select Committee of the House of Commons in 1853.

"Familiarly acquainted with us by means of our literature the Indian youth almost cease to regard us as foreigners......As long as the natives are left to brood over their former independence, their sole specific for improving their condition is the immediate and total expulsion of the English............It is only by the infusion of European ideas that a new direction can be given to national views. The young men brought up in our seminaries turn with contempt from the barbarous despotism under which their ancestors groaned to the prospect of improving their national institutions on the English model...........They have no notion of any improvement but such as rivets their connection with the English and makes them dependent on English protection and instruction."

These views are quoted at some length in order to prove that there was a general belief in the liberalising effects of the English education, and although people differed widely about the objects and probable effects of this education, no one seriously advocated it merely for the purpose of turning out a set of clerks. Such an idea was repudiated by the Indians themselves. The following comments appeared in a Bengali Weekly, on January 26, 1828: "Formerly the English believed that the Indians pick up a smattering of English just enough for serving as clerks. But it now transpires that they are learning English like their own language".[12] The same paper again wrote on March 7, 1829: "The efforts made during the last five or six years for spreading English language and learning in this country are really remarkable. Formerly we heard that the Indians only learnt a little English for securing jobs as clerks. But we now find with surprise that Indian boys venture to study the most advanced texts and most abstruse subjects in English and have mastered even the most difficult branches of English learning"[13].

Another Bengali periodical, *the Sambād Kaumudī*, writes in its issue of August 7, 1830: "It is true that formerly, i.e. both during Hindu and Muslim rule, there was cultivation of learning in this country, but the organization for the spread of useful knowledge among the people in general, such as we find during the British rule, was unknown before. There is as wide a difference between the old and present state of things in this respect as between heaven and the nether world. The number of students in Calcutta and its suburbs alone exceeds ten thousand and the provision of cheap text-books for their use is a sure means of spreading this education."

The unanimously expressed view about the liberal character and the high cultural value of English education is fully supported by what is known of the achievements of the students of those days. For this purpose, we may give a short account of the Hindu College, the premier institution of those days and the only one of which we possess some detailed knowledge.

The memory of the Hindu College is indissolubly bound up with its famous teacher, Henry Louis Vivian Derozio, a half-caste Portuguese. He joined the Hindu College as a Lecturer in 1826 at the age of seventeen and served there for a period of three years only. But even during this short period, this young gifted teacher moulded the entire lives of a number of brilliant students and made a deep impression on them. His views were, however, too radical for the age, and the authorities of the Hindu College dispensed with his services. He died at the age of twenty-three. The following tribute of respect was paid to him in a periodical entitled *Bengal Spectator*, started by some of his students: "About this time the lamented Henry Derozio by his talents and enthusiasm, by his unwearied exertions in and out of the Hindu College, by his course of lectures at Mr. Hare's school, by his regular attendance and exhortations at the weekly meetings of Academic Institution, and above all by his animating, enlightening and cheerful conversation had wrought a change in the mind of the native youth, which is felt to this day, and which will ever be remembered by those who have benefited by it".[14]

Peary-chand Mitra in his *Life of David Hare* says of Derozio: "He used to impress upon them the sacred duty of thinking for themselves—to be in no way influenced by any of the idols mentioned by Bacon—to live and die for truth—to cultivate all the virtues, shunning vice in every shape. He often read examples from ancient history of the love of justice, patriotism, philanthropy and self-abnegation; and the way in which he set forth the points stirred up the minds of his pupils. Some were impressed with the excellence of justice, some with the paramount importance of truth, some with patriotism, some with philanthropy."[15]

The students of the Hindu College held most advanced and sometimes radical views on political, social and economic subjects, and some of them were deeply stirred by patriotic fervour. These will be referred to in detail in Chapter XII. It will suffice here to quote the following extract from the *Englishman* (May, 1836):

"In matters of politics, they are all radicals, and are followers of Benthamite principles. The very word Tory is a sort of ignominy among them;...They think that toleration ought to be practised by every government, and the best and surest way of making the people abandon their barbarous customs and rites is by diffusing education among them. With respect to the questions relating to Political Economy, they all belong to the school of Adam Smith. They are clearly of opinion that the system of monopoly, the restraints upon trade and the international laws of many countries do nothing but paralyse the efforts of industry, impede the progress of agriculture and manufacture, and prevent commerce from flowing in its natural course".[16]

Under the influence of Derozio, the Hindu College students drew their inspiration from Voltaire, Locke, Bacon, Hume, and Tom Paine, among others. A story published in a contemporary Bengali Weekly may be referred to in this connection. An Indian book-seller got 100 copies of Tom Paine's *Age of Reason,* and advertised them for sale at Re. 1/- per copy, but the demand for the book among the Hindu College students was so great that it was sold at Rs. 5/- per copy. Soon after a part of this book was translated into Bengali and published in a Bengali paper.[17]

The advanced ideas on social and political reform held by the Hindu College students were discussed and propagated through their associations and periodical publications. The first of these associations was the "Academic Association or Institution," established in 1828 under the inspiration of Derozio. The subjects discussed in this Association included the following:

"Free will, free ordination, fate, faith, the sacredness of truth, the high duty of cultivating virtue, the meanness of vice, the nobility of patriotism, the attributes of God, and the arguments for and against the existence of the Deity as these have been set forth by Hume on the one side, and Reid, Dugald Stewart and Brown on the other, the hollowness of idolatry and the shams of the priesthood".[18]

Another Association, started in 1838, was the "Society for the Acquisition of General Knowledge". Its main object was to acquire and disseminate useful knowledge about the condition of the country.

A third Association, namely, "The Hindu Theophilanthropic Society", was started in the fourth decade of the nineteenth century under the inspiration of Dr. Duff.

The Hindu College students also published several magazines during the period from 1828 to 1843. These were: *The Parthenon* (1830), *Gyananneshun* (1831 to 1844), *Hindu Pioneer* (1838), and *The Bengal Spectator* (1842). Three other papers were run by the Derozians, namely, the *Hesperus, Inquirer* and *The Quill.*

These magazines dealt in a general way with the condition of the country, science of politics, science of government and jurisprudence, European colonization in India, female education, etc. The *Hindu Pioneer* published articles on *"Freedom"*, *"India under Foreigners"*, and the like. An extract from the latter article quoted in Chapter XII shows the spirit of the students.

This brief sketch of the activities of the Hindu College may be fittingly concluded with an account of a meeting of the "Society for the Acquisition of General Knowledge" held on the 8th February, 1843, in the Hindu College Hall under the chairmanship of Tarachand Chakravarti, a student of the Hindu College. In this meeting, Dakshina-ranjan Mukhopadhyay began to read a paper on "The Present State of the East India Company's Criminal Judicature, and Police under the Bengal Presidency". When he had but read half of his essay, Captain D. L. Richardson, Principal of the College, interrupted him by observing that "he could not permit it (the College Hall) to be converted into a den of treason, and must close the doors against all such things".

Then Tarachand, as President of the Society, said: "Captain Richardson! with due respect, I beg to say that I cannot allow you to proceed any longer in this course of conduct towards our Society, and as President of the Society, and on behalf of my friend Babu Dukhin, I must say, that your remarks are anything but becoming. I am bound also to add that I consider your conduct as an insult to the Society, and that if you do not retract what you have said and make due apology, we shall represent the matter to the Committee of the Hindu College, and if necessary, to the Government itself. We have obtained the use of this public hall by leave, applied for and received from the Committee, and not through your personal favour. You are only a visitor on this occasion, and possess no right to interrupt a member of this Society in the utterance of his opinions. I hope that Captain Richardson will see the propriety of offering an apology to my friend, the writer of the essay, and to the meeting".[19]

This is a remarkable instance of the sturdy spirit of independence by which the students of Hindu College were inspired, and it may be doubted whether similar spirited words of protest have ever been uttered in any academic meeting of an Indian College against its Principal.

Even the brief record of the Hindu College students culled above is sufficient to indicate the nature and value of the Western system of education which was introduced in Bengal during the first half of the nineteenth century. Whatever our views may be about the ultimate effects of this education, there can be no gainsaying the fact that it was not originally conceived in any narrow spirit, only with a view to serve utilitarian purpose. It was planned on a broad basis, as a suitable vehicle for the distinctive traits of Western culture, and was calculated to promote an all-round progress of the students' mind and to develop his character and personality. It is difficult to imagine what better type of education could be devised in those days by the greatest well-wishers of this country, or what more encouraging result could be expected even by the greatest enthusiasts for a modern type of education. The broad and fresh outlook of the students of the Hindu College, their high intellectual eminence and original creative faculties of mind, their familiarity with the most advanced views in every sphere of human activity conceived anywhere in the world, their fervid patriotism—a sentiment almost unknown till then—and the sturdy independence of character shed a lustre on the brief career of this College. It is not possible here to give an account or even simply mention the names of the very large number of brilliant students of this College who played a dominant role in almost all the branches of public life in

Bengal. But it will be difficult to name any institution which turned out so many striking personalities within a period of less than two decades.

III. BRITISH POLICY TOWARDS EDUCATION UP TO 1835.

The antiquity of Indian civilization impressed the Western mind in the latter half of the 18th century. Warren Hastings established in 1781 Calcutta Madrasa (or Muhammadan College) at the request of several Muhammadans of distinction with the object of promoting the study of Arabic and Persian languages and of the Muslim Law. The Sanskrit College at Banaras was founded in 1791 by Jonathan Duncan, Resident in Banaras, for the preservation and cultivation of the laws, literature and religion of the Hindus. The policy of the East India Company was not to interfere in the religious beliefs of its subjects. And though local authorities in India gave pecuniary aid and encouraged Orientalists to compile dictionaries, to translate Hindu and Muslim laws, and to encourage a revival of Oriental learning, yet the development of educational policy towards India and the multiplication of educational institutions can be traced more to Evangelical and Utilitarian movements which formed pressure groups in the political life of England than to anything else.

John Shore (1751-1834) (afterwards Lord Teignmouth), formerly Governor-General of Fort William in Bengal, Charles Grant (1746-1823), M. P. and for some time Chairman and Deputy Chairman and Director of East India Company, William Wilberforce (1759-1833), M. P., Henry Thornton (1760-1815), a leading banker and M. P., who had great influence over the East India Company[20] and directed their beneficence to earthly needs, were dedicated to the cause of education in India.

At the time of the Charter Act of 1793 Charles Grant, with the aim of fostering Christian propaganda, influenced Wilberforce, who moved in the House of Commons that it was the duty of the British Government to send Chaplains and school masters throughout British India. But nothing came out of it, and Wilberforce renewed his efforts at the next renewal of the Charter in 1813. By that time Grant's *Observations on the State of Society among the Asiatic Subjects of Great Britain,*[21] which reflected Evangelical zeal, chiefly written in 1792, laid before the Court of Directors in 1793, and printed by orders of Parliament in 1813, became a very effective treatise and influenced the formation of Indian policy. It was regarded as the best answer to the anti-missionary party headed by Major Scott Waring, and its thesis was that a Hindu mind was submerged in darkness which only the light of Christianity could dispel.[22] Wilberforce marvellously handled a formidable mass of material and produced effect by his convictions and idealism, no less than by his eloquence. In Parliament he declared that the remedy for the ills of Hindu society was neither philosophy nor civilization, but the propagation of Christianity in India.[23] Warren Hastings, Malcolm and Munro had given their evidence against the propagation of Christianity, but the Evangelicals succeeded not only in securing an Episcopal establishment in India, but also the first grant of one lakh of rupees a year set apart, out of the Indian revenue, for 'the encouragement of the learned natives of India, and for the introduction of a knowledge of European sciences among the people'. Lord Minto's timely reference to the lamentable decay of learning in India to the authorities in England provided a handle to the missionaries to press their claim.[24] And though the sum of one lakh allotted for education was meagre, this clause can be described as a landmark in the history of education in India.

Between 1813 and 1823 the East India Company did not develop any educational policy in India. The money sanctioned in 1813 remained unspent and it was not until 17th July, 1823, that the General Committee of Public Instruction at Calcutta was formed and was put in charge of the existing government institutions and of the one lakh grant (with some arrears). The object of the Committee was to equip itself with facts about the state of education in the territories under Bengal Presidency and to suggest ways and means for the better instruction of the people. Between 1813 and 1823, besides the multiplication of missionary schools which offered honourable rivalry to native institutions and gained popularity among Indians, the foundation of Hindu College at Calcutta for the promotion of European learning and languages, as mentioned above, was symptomatic of the native disposition to learn English. But the general policy of the East India Company was to encourage traditional learning in India by giving pecuniary aid, and not to interfere with education or to suggest alternative methods, for fear that this might contravene the policy of religious neutrality. The foundation of the Sanskrit College at Calcutta by Lord Amherst in 1823 represents the continuation of the same traditional policy of the encouragement of Oriental learning. It is to England rather than to India that we should primarily look for the change-over in the educational policy of the East India Company. The persistent advocacy of useful knowledge by the Court of Directors in their Despatches from 1824 onwards was inspired, above all. by the influence of James Mill, Bentham's disciple, who, by virtue of his position at India House, embodied in his Despatches the recurrent theme of Utility as the only touch-stone of education, and pressed upon the Indian Government to follow the principle of Utility in all matters relating to education. By the late twenties there was not any outstanding man among the Directors and it was naturally Mill to whom they looked for advice on vital matters. The Despatch of the Court of Directors, dated 18 February, 1824,[25] which embodied the general principles of the policy on education in India, marks a turning point in the whole educational development in India, because it is the first Directoral Despatch which shows contempt for traditional learning, stresses very clearly the superiority of Western education and insists on spending money on useful learning and not the useless fables of Hindu mythology or the tenets of the Quran. The Committee of Public Instruction in India put a feeble defence of its policy.[26] This Directoral encouragement of the diffusion of useful knowledge continued right up to Bentinck's Resolution of 1835 and it was expected that the initiative would be taken on the lines recommended. In this and other subsequent Despatches there was no decisive suggestion on making English the medium of instruction, because the Directors thought it impracticable for English to become the language of the people of India. It seems clear that they pushed forward the cause indirectly and prepared a definite way for subsequent policy on education, and in their Despatches they referred continuously to the progress of Hindu College and regarded it as a hope for changing the habits and dispositions of the people.

Independently of the official attitude there was growing up in Calcutta and its neighbourhood a disposition to learn English throughout the entire period, as noted above. Rammohan Roy's letter, mentioned above, was passed on to Amherst by Bishop Heber and remained unanswered, but the Committee of Public Instruction regarded it as representing one individual alone whose opinions were well-known to be hostile to those entertained by all his countrymen.[27] Even a conservative like Radhakanta Dev, who received his elementary education at Mr. Cumming's Calcutta Academy, propagated the cause of English and was one of the more active Governors of Hindu College.[28] The study of Parliamentary Papers, Court Despatches and the accounts of travellers, indicates that long before the official Resolution of 1835, Indians were themselves sensible of the great advantages of learning English.[29] Adam notes that those institutions were gaining popularity which offered English teaching, and F. J. Shore found the English language becoming fashionable[30] among the rising generations. The account of the Hindu College, given above, shows how much the study of English classics had gained a hold on the minds of pupils.

The funds placed at the disposal of the General Committee of Public Instruction were limited, and the question turned on how the money was to be spent: should Western knowledge be diffused through English or the classical languages? The question of making English a compulsory subject in the Arabic College at Calcutta "finally put the match to the train of major controversy of 1834".[31] The Act of 1813 was interpreted in ways favourable to the attitude of the members of the Committee who found themselves equally divided.

For a long time it has been generally held by the historians that it was Macaulay's minute which proved decisive in the introduction of English as the medium of instruction. But the ground had already been prepared long before Macaulay arrived in India. The historical process of the entire movement had been in operation for a long time and nothing caused or moved this process more than the Evangelical and Utilitarian ideas. Furthermore, the public employment of Indians in places where the number of Europeans could be curtailed on grounds of economy gave stimulus to education.[32] The Chairman of the Court of Directors, William Astell, in his letter to Bentinck, reflected the anxiety of the Court to afford every reasonable facility for the education of the natives.[33] Bentinck anticipated collateral advantages by introducing English as the language of public business in all departments,[34] and the authorities in England, though preferring English to Persian, hinted at the adoption of vernacular languages, but still left the whole question to the better judgment and superior local knowledge of Bentinck.[35]

When Bentinck reached India, British power was established more firmly than at any former time. In England he had met James Mill at Mrs. Grote's house and assured him that in reality Bentham would be the Governor-General of India.[36] Bentham wrote to Bentinck on November 19, 1829: "It seems to me that I behold the golden age of India lying before me"; and very much desired Bentinck to encourage the diffusion of education and useful knowledge.[37] Bentinck was a simple, though confirmed, Westerner,[38] who had both intellectual and moral clarity. He had a Utilitarian faith in education as a means for the elevation of human character.[39] He wrote of the British language as the key to all improvements.[40] In his letter of 1st June, 1834, to Mancy, he outlined his views on education: "General education is my panacea for the regeneration of India."[41] It seems clear that before Macaulay reached India, Bentinck had already formulated his plans. Charles Trevelyan's letters to Bentinck indicate that being a compound of a radical and a despot, Bentinck was only waiting for the ripe moment,[42] and there seems a clear and delightful conspiracy between him and the young, fervent Trevelyan, who, in his frenzied zeal, intended to secure the preference of European over Oriental learning. Trevelyan dreamt of planting Western civilization not only in India but in the whole of Asia, and regarded "our language" as a proper means for doing so.[43] Bentinck watched carefully the indications of the time—the thoughts and disposition of Hindus to learn English—and he utilized his power firmly in actually moulding the process then at work. As compared with Mill, Bentinck had an extra advantage in this that being on the spot, he was more able to assert in practice the doctrine of Utility.[44] He had a hand in the game that was being played and he hit the ball now more clearly than before and fulfilled what Grant had hoped, what Mill had pushed forward, what Trevelyan had almost decided upon with Bentinck, what E. Ryan had long entertained,[45] and what Macaulay put forth in a bold and highly coloured fashion in his Minute reflecting much of Bentinck's mind, though the latter might not have appreciated the sentimental parts.[46]

Macaulay was a mixture of the Benthamite theory of legislation and Evangelical vehemence in sentiment. His Minute on Education was brilliant, though he tried to 'disguise the thinness of his legal reason by taking refuge in bold and emphatic rhetoric'. His main thesis was that all the learning of the East was nothing beside the metaphysics of Locke and physics of Newton, and that it was only the torch of Western learning that could illumine the Indian mind, submerged in superstition and ignorance. His view on Indian society reflected Utilitarian contempt for Oriental civilisation and his Minute reads like James Mill's compositions.[47] He advocated a root and branch policy to sweep away everything of the past and to write afresh. Macaulay pointed out that English books in India were much in demand whereas Sanskrit and Arabic books found practically no purchasers. His object was to 'form a class of persons, Indian in blood and in colour, but English in tastes, in opinions, and in morals and in intellect'. The Orientalists, led by Prinsep, thought it impracticable to make English the language of the people, and were of the opinion that the introduction of English would upset the existing arrangements and kill vernaculars. They urged that the stuff might be in a greater degree European, but must in all cases be interwoven with home-spun material. Macaulay, on the other hand, pointed out the plight of those students from Sanskrit College who found no employment anywhere, and considered that the dialects nad no value. Macaulay passed his Minute on to Bentinck and made the whole problem clearer and more intelligible than ever before and created a peculiar situation when solution—one way or the other naturally influenced by his threat of resignation—

could no longer be postponed. Bentinck grasped the reality and the intensity of the situation, and gave his entire concurrence to the sentiments expressed in Macaulay's Minute. Macaulay was not the herald of the dawn. His thesis merely confirmed Bentinck's opinions, who issued his Resolution of the 7th March, 1835, which stated: "The great object of the British Government ought to be the promotion of European literature and science among the natives of India; and that all the funds appropriated for the purpose of education would be best employed on English education alone."

It is not possible here to deal at length with the various criticisms of the new educational policy. Reference may only be made to a few of them. It has been held that the effect of English education has been to create a group sharply separated from their fellow Indians, and almost setting up a new caste in this caste-ridden country. Nobody can deny the truth of this charge, so far at least as the best part of the nineteenth century is concerned. The main reason for this is the very small number of men who were educated in English as compared with the rest who had no such education. Besides, the English-educated classes at first occupied higher administrative posts and this created a cleavage between them and the masses. Far worse was, however, a dual mentality which the English-educated people had to maintain. Their liberal ideas found little favour with the orthodox members of the family, particularly the women folk who clung to the old traditional ideas, customs, and practices. The educated few might discuss the liberal principles among themselves, in clubs or other associations, but fell in the old groove as soon as they returned home. This existence as a sort of Jekyll and Hyde was not conducive, either to the mental peace or to the intellectual development of the class as a whole. This is one of the main reasons why Western education did not produce all the benefits that could be reasonably expected.

There is, however, one criticism, often repeated even now, against the new educational policy which is due to misunderstanding. It has been regretted by many on the ground that it gave an undue favour to English against vernacular as the medium of instruction. As a matter of fact the decision merely meant that English, and not Sanskrit or Arabic, should be the medium of higher education. It had no reference to vernacular which would remain the medium of a system of national education embracing every village in the country. This was clearly laid down in the report of the Committee drawn up in the same year in which the above resolution about English education was passed.[47a] Even the Orientalists never fought for making vernaculars the medium of instruction. It was not a practical proposition in those days where, as in Bengal, vernaculars were not sufficiently developed to be used as the vehicle of instruction in higher branches of literature and sciences. It was, however, given a fair trial in Bombay and the North-Western Provinces, as will be shown later. But the vernacular literature in these two Provinces did not make progress in any way comparable to that in Bengal.

The Orientalists, however, did not accept the new policy, lying down. As a protest, two of them retired from the Committee of Public Instruction. A petition, signed by 10,000 Hindu inhabitants of Calcutta and of Zillas, was sent to the Court of Directors protesting against the Resolution of 1835. The Asiatic Society sent a memorial to the local Government whereas the Court of Directors and the Board of Control were pressed hard by the strong remonstrances from the Royal Asiatic Society. For long the Home authorities were unwilling to send their orders on the subject of the changes in education in Bengal,[47b] and Hobhouse, who replaced Charles Grant as President of the Board of Control, refrained from provoking another controversy[47c] and appreciated Auckland's Minute of 24th November, 1839.[47d] To Auckland both Macaulay and Prinsep represented extreme positions and here operated the English sense of compromise which brought the issues comparatively nearer, and reconciled existing differences of opinion.[47e] Auckland did not reverse Bentinck's decision[47f] but modified it and restored to a certain extent the altogether neglected Oriental learning which met the approbation of the Court of Directors in their Despatch of 20th January, 1841, though they did not express any decided opinion on the medium of instruction.

IV. GENERAL POLICY AND PROGRESS OF ENGLISH EDUCATION (1835-57).

The Resolution of Lord William Bentinck gave a great impetus to the progress of English Education in India. Its effects were felt immediately in Bengal and gradually in the other Presidencies. Between 1835 and 1838 the number of seminaries of Public Instruction in the Bengal Presidency rose to forty, and the number of students from about three thousand and four hundred to six thousand.[48] "The tide had set in", wrote Trevelyan in 1838, "in favour of English education and when the Committee declared itself on the same side, the public support they received rather went beyond than fell short of what was required".[49] A Resolution of another Governor-General gave additional support to the cause of English education in India by making a knowledge of it essential for prospects in Government services. It was Lord Hardinge's Educational Despatch of 10th October, 1844, which declared that "in every possible case a preference shall be given in the selection of candidates for public employment to those who have been educated in the institutions thus established and specially to those who have distinguished themselves therein by more than ordinary degree of merit and attainment". It was thought that the test for public services was to be conducted under the superintendence of the Council of Education, which had replaced the Committee of Public Instruction in Bengal (1842-43).

In Bengal, the number of schools under the control of the Council of Education rose from 28 in 1843 to 151 in 1855, and the number of pupils from 4,632 in 1843 to 13,163 in 1855. Annual Government expenditure on education had only increased from Rs. 4,12,284, in 1843 to Rs. 5,94,428 in 1855.[50]

In 1845 the Council of Education in Calcutta, under the Presidentship of Charles Hay Cameron, drew up a plan for a University in Calcutta, but it could not be implemented, probably because it was discountenanced by the authorities in England. There was some progress in the spread of English education in Bombay and Madras before 1854, due mainly to State efforts, though it did not compare favourably with what had been achieved in this respect in Bengal by that time.

The subject of education received serious consideration of the Company's Government on the eve of the renewal of the Charter of 1853. Lord Dalhousie himself took interest in mass education. He desired to "establish a complete class of vernacular schools, to extend throughout the whole of India, with a view to convey instruction to the masses of the people." He also proposed to place the higher education of the people, especially in Calcutta, on "a footing adequate to the wants of the community, and worthy of the Government of the Hon'ble Company". With the encouragement of the Governor-General, the local Governments in Bengal, Bombay and the Panjab extended encouragement to vernacular education. Further, a Parliamentary Committee, appointed to inquire into the state of education, examined a number of witnesses including experienced persons like Trevelyan and Duff.

A highly significant step regarding education in India was soon taken by the Company's Government. It was the famous Educational Despatch No. 49, dated 19th July, 1854, which was drafted by Sir Charles Wood, President of the Board of Control, and forwarded to India through the Court of Directors, and which imposed upon the Government the duty of "creating a properly articulated system of education, from the primary school to the University".

The Educational Despatch of 1854, described as the "Magna Carta of English Education in India", formed a landmark in the history of education in modren India, because it outlined a comprehensive plan which supplied the basis for the subsequent development of educational system in this country. This Despatch, the principles of which were confirmed by the Secretary of State for India in the Despatch of the 7th April, 1859, commended to the special attention of the Government of India "the improvement and far wider extension of education, both English and vernacular", and recommended the following measures for the attainment of these objects:—1. the constitution of a separate department of the administration for education; 2. the institution of universities at the Presidency towns; 3. the establishment of institutions for training teachers for all classes of schools; 4. the maintenance of the existing Government Colleges and High Schools and the increase of their number when necessary; 5. the establishment of new Middle Schools; 6. increased attention to vernacular schools, indigenous or others, for elementary education; and 7. the introduction of a system of grants-in-aid. The attention of the Government was "specially directed to the importance of placing the means of acquiring useful and practical knowledge within reach of the great mass of the people. The English language is to be the medium of instruction in the higher branches, and the vernacular in the lower. English is to be taught wherever there is a demand for it, but it is not to be substituted for the vernacular languages of the country. The system of grants-in-aid is to be based on the principle of perfect religious neutrality.....A comprehensive system of scholarships is to be instituted so as to connect lower schools with higher, and higher schools with colleges. Female education is to receive the frank and cordial support of Government".

In accordance with the recommendation of Wood's Despatch steps were soon taken "to form an Education Department in each of the great territorial divisions of India as then constituted, and before the end of 1856, the new system was fairly at work. The formation of the separate Departments continued over a period of about 12 years, from 1854-55 in the larger provinces to 1866-67 in the Hyderabad Assigned Districts".[51]

A Director of Public Instruction was appointed in each Province, with a staff of Inspectors and Deputy or Assistant Inspectors.

This organization of inspection and control continued 'substantially unchanged' in the subsequent periods with such additions or alterations as were required by the formation of new territorial divisions or by the amalgamation of old ones. The Education Department in each Province came directly under the Provincial Government. Under this arrangement the Education Departments became more or less officialised in character. It has been rightly pointed out by Prof. Dodwell that the men in charge of these Departments being 'primarily administrators', education "tended to become a matter of administration and routines".[52] The anomaly has continued more or less till now.

Within a few years after 1854 the political atmosphere in India was greatly ruffled by the outbreak of 1857. Yet, this year has a great significance in the history of Indian education, for it witnessed the establishment of three Indian universities on the lines of principles laid down in the Despatch of 1854. It was noted in that Despatch that "the time has now arrived for the establishment of universities in India, which may encourage a regular and liberal course of education, by conferring academical degrees, as evidence of attainments in the different branches of arts and science and by adding marks of honour for those who may desire to compete for honorary distinction". The University of London was to serve as the model for the Indian universities, whose function was "to be to confer degrees upon such persons, as having been entered as candidates according to the rules which may be fixed in this respect, and having produced from any of the 'affiliated institutions' . . . certificates of conduct, and of having pursued a regular course of study for a given time shall have also passed at the Universities such an examination as may be required of them".

The University of Calcutta was incorporated by an Act, passed on the 24th January, 1857; the University of Bombay by an Act passed on the 18th July, 1857; and the University of Madras, by an Act passed on the 5th September, 1857. The affairs of each University were to be managed by a Chancellor and a Senate consisting of the Vice-Chancellor and Fellows who were mainly Government servants. To start with, the Calcutta University Senate had thirty-eight members of whom six were Indians, while in the Bombay University there were five Indians in a Senate of twenty-nine, and in the Madras University three Indians out of forty members. The Governor-General was the Chancellor of the Calcutta University while the Governors of Bombay and Madras were the Chancellors, respectively, of the two Universities there. Regarding higher education the spheres of control of the Universities of Bombay and

Madras were the territorial jurisdictions of the respective Presidencies and Native States of Western and Southern India, while that of the Calcutta University extended over the whole of Northern India, the Central Provinces and British Burma.

Each of these Universities had at first the four Faculties, namely those of Arts cum Science, Law, Medicine and Engineering, to which was added subsequently a separate Science Faculty. These Universities remained affiliating and examining bodies. The recommendation of the Despatch of 1854 for the institution of Professorships "for the purpose of delivery of lectures in the various branches of learning" was rejected by Lord Dalhousie on the ground that the Universities would not be qualified to supervise actual tuition.[53] The teaching was imparted in the colleges,—Government, missionary and private. Some High Schools had College classes, and several Colleges arranged classes in school-courses. Most of the colleges in this period provided education in Arts. As regards technical colleges, there were two Colleges of Engineering, one started at Roorkee in the North-Western Provinces in 1847 and the other was the Calcutta College of Engineering, opened at the Writers' Buildings, Calcutta, in November, 1856, amalgamated with the Presidency College in 1865, and shifted to Sibpur in 1880. The Overseer's school of Poona was raised to the status of the Poona College of Engineering and affiliated to the Bombay University in 1858. In the Madras Presidency the industrial school attached to the Gun Carriage Factory became Guindy College of Engineering and was affiliated to the Madras University in 1858. Medical training was being imparted in the Medical Colleges in Calcutta, Bombay and Madras, and in the Lahore Medical School. Law Departments were attached to Arts Colleges and separate Law Colleges came into existence later.

V. GENERAL POLICY AND PROGRESS OF ENGLISH EDUCATION (1858-1905).

During the period between 1857 and 1882 there was an increase in the number of Colleges and students in the three Universities. At the first Entrance Examinations of the three Universities, 219 students came out successful,—162 (out of 244 candidates) in Calcutta, 21 in Bombay, and 36 in Madras. In 1882, out of 7,429 candidates, who appeared at the Entrance Examination, 2,778 were successful. India had 27 Colleges in 1857 and the number rose to 72 in 1882. "During the first 14 years 2,666 candidates passed the First Arts (Intermediate) Examination, 850, the B.A. Examination, and 151, the M.A. During the next 11 years the corresponding numbers were 5,969, 2,434, and 385".

The growth in the numerical strength of students and the consideration of the extensive areas of jurisdiction of the existing Universities led to the establishment of two other Universities during the nineteenth century. These were the University of Lahore and the University of Allahabad. In Lahore the movement for a University was started by some influential persons, backed by the Lieutenant Governor, Sir Donald Macleod. They demanded an Oriental University, which, besides promoting the study of Eastern classics and vernacular languages of the country, was also to encourage the study of English language and Western science. In August, 1867, the British Indian Association of the North-Western Provinces (modern United Provinces) submitted a petition to the Governor-General indicating the defects of the prevailing educational system and recommending the establishment in the Province of a University in which "the Eastern classics and the vernacular would be duly encouraged side by side with English education". For certain reasons the Government of India did not agree to these demands, but sanctioned in December, 1869, the establishment of the Lahore University College. The specific objects of this College were "to promote the diffusion of European Science, as far as possible, through the medium of vernacular languages of the Punjab, and the improvement and extension of vernacular literature generally", and to "afford encouragement to the enlightened study of Eastern classical languages and literature". It was at the same time declared that "every encouragement would be afforded to the study of the English language and literature; and in all subjects which cannot be completely taught in the vernacular, the English language would be regarded as the medium of instruction and examination".[54] A large number of institutions were affiliated to the Lahore University College and its activities expanded for a decade before another demand for a University in the Punjab was put forth. The Government of Lord Ripon acceded to this demand and a notification of the Punjab Government, dated the 14th October, 1882, formally constituted the Punjab University with the Lieutenant-Governor of the Punjab as its Chancellor and with a constitution more or less similar to those of the other Indian Universities. The total number of Arts Colleges in India (excluding Burma and Ajmer) in 1881-82 were 59 with 5399 students.[55]

The Allahabad University was incorporated by an Act, dated the 23rd September, 1887, with a constitution closely resembling that of the University of Calcutta.

On the 3rd February, 1882, the Government of India appointed a Commission with Sir W. W. Hunter as its President, "to enquire particularly into the manner in which effect had been given to the principles of the Despatch of 1854, and to suggest such measures as might seem desirable in order to further carrying out of the policy therein laid down". Though the chief object of inquiry of this Commission was to be the "present state of elementary education and the means by which this can everywhere be extended and improved", it collected plenty of useful information about collegiate education, especially regarding attendance, fees, discipline and later career of the students. Some of its important recommendations were:—1. withdrawal of State from direct management and support of institutions for higher education should be by slow and cautious steps; 2. provision to be made for ordinary financial aid and special grants to Colleges; 3. "in order to encourage diversity of culture, both on the literary and on the physical side", there should be provision in all the larger colleges, Government and aided, "for more than one of the alternative courses laid down by the Universities"; 4. "an attempt to be made to prepare a moral text-book, based upon the fundamental principles of natural religion, such as may be taught in all Government and non-Government colleges"; 5. "the Principal or one of the Professors in each Government and aided college to deliver to each of the college classes in every session in all Government and non-Government colleges a series of lectures on the duties of a man and a citizen". 6. observance of certain general principles for college fees and exemption from these and attendance; 7. framing new regulations for grant of scholarships.

With its conviction that "it is no less essential to the welfare of the community that provision should be made for the maintenance and development of colleges and schools of the higher class"[56] than the development of elementary education, the Hunter Commission made twenty-three recommendations on the subject of secondary education, the more important of which were as follows:—1. "In the upper classes of high schools there should be two divisions,—one leading to the entrance examination of the universities, the other of a more practical character intended to fit youths for commercial, or other non-literary pursuits; 2. provision should be made in respect of grant for the formation and maintenance of libraries in all high schools and for furniture and apparatus of instruction; 3. new rules should be framed for charging fees from students and for grants of scholarships to them; 4. "it be distinctly laid down that the relation of the state to secondary is different from its relation to primary education, in that the means of primary education may be provided without regard to the existence of local co-operation, while it is ordinarily expedient to provide the means of secondary education only where adequate local co-operation is forthcoming, and that therefore, in all ordinary cases, secondary schools for instruction in English be hereafter established by the State preferably on the footing of the system of grants-in-aids"

The Government of India approved of nearly all the recommendations of the Hunter Commission. In a Resolution, dated the 23rd October, 1884, recorded in the Home Department, the Governor-General in Council reviewed the Report of the Hunter Commission, and laid down for the future guidance of Local Governments and Administrators the main lines of the educational policy which the Government of India intended to pursue. In expressing his approval of this Resolution, the Secretary of State for India communicated the following instructions to the Government of India: "In order to stimuate the efforts of the various authorities in the promotion of education on the lines now laid down, it would, I think, be well if your Excellency in Council would direct the preparation of General Annual Report, embracing the important features of the several provincial reports (including Madras and Bombay), transmit copies of the same to the Secretary of State, with a Resolution by the Government of India reviewing such General Report". According to these instructions the work of preparing the General Report was first entrusted to Sir Alfred Croft, Director of Public Instruction in Bengal, whose 'Review of Education in India in 1886' is a valuable record containing detailed information on the subject.

With occasional fluctuations due to natural calamities like plague or famine, there was, by the close of the nineteenth century, increase in the number of institutions as well as students. At the end of the year 1901-2, about 4,000,000 students were receiving instruction in nearly 105,000 public institutions of various grades, and more than 600,000 pupils were under instruction in about 43,000 private institutions outside the scope of the Department of Public Instruction. More than 17,500 undergraduates were by that year getting education in 145 Arts Colleges, while there was a total enrolment of 5,400 students in 46 colleges meant for teaching of law, medicine, and other professional studies. From 1881-82 the number of pupils in secondary schools had increased by 180 per cent. and that in primary schools by 49 per cent. On the whole there was quantitative expansion of education. But even then there was staggering illiteracy of the vast masses of the people of India. According to the census of 1901 "the proportion of persons able to read and write to the total population was 98 per 1,000 in the case of males, and 7 per 1,000 in the case of females." As regards Primary Education of the masses, the declarations of the despatch of 1854 and of the Education Commission of 1882, though reaffirmed by the Government several times, remained more or less barren of good results, both from qualitative and quantitative points of view. By the end of 1901-2 "only about one-sixth of the boys of school-going age (calculated at 15 per cent. of the total male population) were following the primary course in public institutions".

The period of Lord Curzon's administration was marked by some striking changes in the sphere of education as in the other branches. Insistently there beats through Curzon's utterances the urge to frame a sound educational policy. He realized that there was something rotten in the State of Denmark. For years education had been muddling along. In primary education four out of every five Indian villages were found to be without a school; three out of every four Indian boys grew up without education, and only one Indian girl in every 40 attended any kind of school.[57] Curzon thought that primary education was languishing nearly everywhere for want of funds.[58] Secondary schools really sapped the brain power as well as the physical strength of the rising generation.[59] In higher education, the position seemed to him still worse. The standards of teaching and learning were equally low.[60] Curzon saw in his mind's eye the students driven like sheep from lecture room to lecture room and from examination to examination. Though the members of the Indian Universities Commission (1902) saw no reason to regret the decision of the Government in 1854,[61] Curzon drew a very depressing picture of the state of education in his time: the text-books prescribed were badly chosen; degrees were pursued for their commercial value; the Senates were over-swollen with members, whose aims were not academic; and the Syndicates were devoid of statutory powers.[62] Only 2½% of the female population of school-going age attended schools.[63] Everywhere words rather than ideas were studied.[64] There was too slavish an imitation of the European model,[65] and the members of the Indian Universities Commission admitted that teaching had been made subsidiary to examination.[66] Instead of thinking only of the mental and moral development, teachers were preoccupied with percentages, passes and tabulated results.[67] An Indian University was not even a collection of buildings. No wonder Curzon felt despondent as to the efficacy and standards of a system which showed by statistics that out of the thousands of young men, who sat for the matriculation examination of the various universities, only 1 in 17 ultimately took a degree,[68] and Curzon wondered whether the preceding stages were not too easy. To Curzon the whole system was at fault and reminded him of the days of Hebrew judges when there was no king in Israel.[69]

The above facts about education fired him with a burning zeal to take up the subject of educational reform. In pursuance of his policy of thoroughness and efficiency, Lord Curzon sought to reorganize the educational system and to effectively control the educational institutions of the country. After a preliminary survey, the Viceroy summoned in September, 1901, a conference of chief education officers at Simla "to consider the system of education in India". On the 27th January, 1902, his Government appointed a Universities Commission "to inquire into the conditions and prospects of the Indian Universities, to report upon proposals which might improve their constitution and working, and to recommend such measures as might tend to elevate the standard of University teaching and to promote the advancement of learning".[70] The Commission was presided over by Mr. (afterwards, Sir) Thomas Raleigh, Legal Member of the Viceroy's Executive Council. The members included Mr. Syed Husain Bilgrami, Director of Public Instruction in the Nizam's Dominions, and when the Hindu community complained that it was unrepresented, Mr. Justice Gurudas Banerjee, a Judge of the Calcutta High Court, was added to the Commission.[71]

The Commission visited all the universities and a number of affiliated colleges during its three months tour and submitted its Report in June, 1902. Its principal recommendations were as follows:—

"1. The legal powers of the older universities should be enlarged so that all the universities may be recognised as Teaching Bodies, but the local limits of each university should be more accurately defined and steps taken to remove from the Calcutta University the affiliated colleges in the Central Provinces, United Provinces, etc."

2. The Senate, the Syndicate and the Faculties have to be reorganised and made more representative than before.

3. More stringent conditions were to be imposed for the recognition of affiliated institutions, and there should be insistence on the better equipment of affiliated colleges, and supervision of the discipline of students and their places of residence.

4. There should be a properly constituted Governing Body for each College.

5. Suggestions were made for important changes in the courses of study and methods of examination.

6. That a minimum rate of college fees should be fixed.

7. That Second-grade colleges (teaching only up to the I.A. standard) should be gradually abolished.

8. That the system of teaching law by law classes attached to Arts colleges should be modified.

The Government expressed general approval of the Commission's recommendations except the last three, on which further inquiries were to be made before coming to a final decision. The Report of the Commission and the Government comments were published in October, 1902, and they were at once subjected to severe opposition by the Indians of all classes. The main point of attack was that if the recommendations were given effect to, Senates and Syndicates would be officialised and the Universities would be practically converted into Government Departments. A big public meeting was held in the Calcutta Town Hall to protest against the recommendations, and "old men, bent down with the weight of years", as Surendra-nath Banerji put it, "came tottering to place on record their protest against the recommendations of the Commission."[72] Pherozeshah Mehta took a leading part in opposing the recommendations, and the Indian National Congress, in its session at Ahmadabad in 1902, passed a comprehensive resolution on the subject, which is partly quoted below:—

"That this Congress views with the greatest alarm many of the Commission's recommendations, the acceptance of which will, in its opinion, reverse the policy steadily pursued during the last half-a-century by the British Government in the matter of higher education, by checking its spread and restricting its scope, and by virtually destroying such limited independence as the Universities at present enjoy."

In addition to the last three recommendations, specified above, the Congress strongly objected, in particular, to (a) the introduction of a rigidly uniform course of studies throughout the country; (b) the virtual licensing of all secondary education; and (c) the officialisation of the Senate and the Syndicate and the practical conversion of the University into a Department of Government.

On 21 March, 1904, was passed the Indian Universities Act, based mainly on the recommendations of the Education Commission of 1902. The Act fixed the number of Ordinary Fellows at a minimum of fifty and a maximum of one hundred for the three older universities, and at a minimum of forty and maximum of seventy-five for the other two. These numbers were exclusive of the Chancellor, the Vice-Chancellor, the Rector of the Calcutta University, and the ex-officio

Fellows, who were also members of the Senate and whose maximum number was fixed at ten for each University. The tenure of office of the ordinary members was limited to a period of five years. The Act fixed the number of elected Fellows at twenty for the three older universities and fifteen for the other two. The Syndicate of a University was to consist of the Vice-Chancellor, the Director of Public Instruction and not less than seven or more than fifteen Fellows, "elected by the Senate or by the Faculties in such manner as may be provided by the regulations". Adequate representation of university teachers on the Syndicates was to be provided. The university was to have enhanced powers of supervision over the affiliated colleges and conditions for the affiliation of new ones were made more stringent (one of the immediate effects was reduction in the number of affiliated colleges). All affiliations and disaffiliations of colleges were to be finally settled by the Government; appointments of Professors, Readers and Lecturers were subject to the approval of the Government; and many details of university policy were subject to Government supervision. "Practically nothing was to be done without the approval of the Government".[73]

An important feature of the Act was provision by the universities for the "instruction of students, with power to appoint university Professors and Lecturers, to hold and manage educational endowments, to erect, equip and maintain university laboratories and museums, to make regulations relating to the residence and conduct of students, and to do all acts which tend to the promotion of study and research". It was not, however, applied for many years in most of the Universities, though the Calcutta University under the guidance of its most distinguished Vice-Chancellor, Sir Ashutosh Mookerjee, started post-graduate teaching in the University within a few years.

The Bill, which was ultimately passed into the Indian Universities Act of 1904, was strongly opposed by the Indian public. The Indian National Congress, in its Madras Session, 1903, entered its protest against the general principles of the Bill which, if passed into law, "will have the effect of restricting the area of education and completely destroying the independence of the Universities upon which largely depend their efficiency and usefulness..." The Congress also made a number of constructive suggestions for modifying the Bill. There was a protracted debate upon the Bill in the Council where a bitter attack was made upon it by G. K. Gokhale.

As could be expected, Lord Curzon did not pay much heed to the public criticism, and vigorously defended the Bill. He said he did not regret the battle or the storm waged over the University legislation, for he was "firmly convinced that out of them had been born a new life for Higher Education in India".[74] He defended the sincere aims of the Simla Conference which had been denounced as "some dark and sinister conspiracy".[75] He regarded the University legislation and the form that sprang from it as a decree of emancipation,[76] and believed that it had put education on a sounder footing. One of his biographers, Lovat Fraser, has nothing but enthusiastic praise for the Act, and even went so far as to say, in 1911, that "many who were at first alarmed are ready to admit with alacrity that it has had admirable results".[77] On the other hand, another biographer, Earl of Ronaldshay, mournfully admits that the high hopes entertained by Lord Curzon were far from being realized. He is perhaps nearer the truth. But it is only fair to point out that the public criticism of the measure was not duly tempered by a consideration of the actual state of things prevailing at the time. There is no doubt that the Senate, the supreme governing body, was unwieldy, and its composition was not dictated by academic interest. The Senate of the Calcutta, Madras and Bombay University had, respectively, 180, 197 and 310 members, called Fellows, some of whom could hardly sign their names.[78] The Fellowship in those days, like Justice of the Peace, was regarded as an honour, and academic distinctions were hardly considered as a requisite qualification for its selection.[79] It would be idle to deny also that some, if not many, of the educational institutions, in those days, were run more as profitable business concerns than as academic institutions for imparting education and developing character. It is undoubtedly true that the legislation of 1904 tightened the control of Government over higher education, but it may be pertinently asked, whether any other agency could remove the aforesaid abuses, and make the University, which was merely an examining body, an institution for higher study and research also. It is true that all the Universities had not been transformed as much as Lord Curzon hoped they would. But the example of the Calcutta University during the next twenty years showed what great improvements were possible within the framework of the Act of 1904, in spite of the handicaps imposed by it. There is some truth in the observations of Mr. Chailley, a Frenchman and an umprejudiced commentator, that the Universities Act of 1904 "constitutes the real charter of present day education in India".[80]

VI. VERNACULAR AND PRIMARY EDUCATION.[81]

The state of indigenous education in Bengal about the beginning of the period under review has been described briefly in the preceding chapter on the basis of Adam's Report.[81a] More or less the same state of things prevailed in other parts of India, though the extent to which the elementary education spread among the masses, and the subjects or detailed syllabus of higher education must have varied in different parts of the country.

When Adam presented his first report on the intellectual condition of the people, he was greatly impressed by the large number of village schools scattered over Bengal and Bihar which convinced him of a deep-seated desire in the minds of parents, even of the humblest classes, to give education to their children. But his second and third reports on education brought out the defects in the system that had at first seemed so satisfactory, and he modified his earlier opinions and presented a melancholy picture of the depressed state of instruction as it existed amongst the masses of the Indian population.

Adam wrote that, considering only the population of teachable age, in Natore (Rajshahi district) the proportion of instructed to uninstructed was 132 to 1000, but that in the whole adult male population, the proportion of instructed to uninstructed was 114.6 to 1000. Adam's reports indicate that of children of school-going age in Bengal, there were only 7.75 per cent. who received instruction of any kind, even the most elementary. William Ward supposed that of the persons grown up to maturity among the male population in Bengal, not more than 200 in 1000 could read, and women were almost in every instance unable to do so. The Board of Revenue observed that only 1 in 67 was receiving education in the territories under the Madras Presidency, but Sir Thomas Munro estimated the portion of male population who received school education to be nearer to one-third rather than one-fourth of the whole. In his valuable report, A. D. Campbell points out that in Bellary district not more than 7 individuals in a 1000 of the entire population attended schools. In Delhi territory, Metcalfe's report shows a percentage of about 10. Inquiries conducted by the Government of North-Western Provinces indicated that the greatest ignorance prevailed amongst the people throughout those provinces, and that there were no adequate means for affording them instruction. W. D. Arnold was confronted with a population in the Panjāb which was ignorant of the history and geography of its own province and knew little beyond elementary arithmetic. In Lande schools[82] in the Panjāb, children wrote in a character which neither they themselves nor anybody else could decipher an hour after it had been written. Richard Jenkins, Resident at Nagpur, found that with the exception of the children of Brahmans and merchants, all the other classes were extremely illiterate. Dubois, who knew Southern India very well, records that there was no public institution which was, properly speaking, devoted to the diffusion of knowledge. Lord Moira notes that the want of instruction in the territory of Rajputana might be judged by the fact that "the first Minister of Jeypore, otherwise a man of ability, could not write and could scarcely read'.[83] With individual exceptions, the female population of the teachable age was growing up without any knowledge of reading and writing, though W. D. Arnold mentions that female education was to be found in many parts in the Panjāb.

Those who attacked traditional learning did so on the ground that teachers were not qualified and followed other professions to eke out their income. Many Pandits had never seen a printed book and even manuscripts were unknown to them. The majority of them were superficial even according to the standard of their countrymen. Agricultural and commercial accounts became the *summum bonum* which circumscribed rather than enlarged the minds of pupils, and there was no attempt whatsoever to acquire the orthography of the language of the country, or a knowledge of its geography or history. In Muhammadan schools, the loose system of private tuition largely prevailed and though Muslim priests committed to memory substantial portions of the Qurān, very few really understood its meaning or could explain Muslim law. Missionaries condemned the Indian teacher for imparting instruction from books which contained no 'moral truths'. Works of Saadi were read for enjoyment and Sir Thomas Munro[84] ridiculed the story of Majnun. Persian was studied both by the Hindus and Muslims, and was considered an accomplishment in a gentleman and a passport for employment in revenue and judicial administration.

On the content of instruction imparted, the Evangelical Charles Grant, the sympathetic Thomas Munro, the candid Heber, the Baptist Ward, the fervent Lord Moira, the Orientalist Wilson, the calculating Rammohan Roy, the zealous C. E. Trevelyan, and the painstaking missionary Adam said trenchant things and their portrait of indigenous learning is by no means favourable. The learned Brahmans had told 'Mr. Prinsep that the British system was most rational but that their own answered all their purposes'.[85] The worst feature of the indigenous system was that learning tended towards pedantry, mere automatism and an exercise of memory only. It turned out accomplished Pandits and Maulvis who possessed the logical finesse of the Medieval schoolmen. There were child prodigies who performed amazing feats in multiplication tables. But advanced learning was confined to a group, exclusive, scholastic and unworldly at times, but somewhat rigid, which could not share its rewards with the ignorant mass of the people. And being steeped in the austerities of scholastic learning, these well-meaning men wrote commentaries on the accumulated wisdom of the past, knew but a small portion of the world, and lacked breadth and sweep of vision. Their scheme of knowledge ignored man and his role in society and nature; they sought things in words and quoted texts with unquestioning trust; their minds were used to receiving opinions from authority and they imitated models which set manners over matter.

The entire system of indigenous learning depended mainly on the support and voluntary contribution of opulent Hindu and Muslim families (*Zamindars, Talukdars* and shopkeepers), charity lands, or inducements given to scholars by gifts of money, or in the form of shelter, clothing and often food. The teacher depended on endowments and patronage, and students were given stipends for prosecuting their studies. Students seldom paid their teachers. Adam's idea of basing all schemes of Indian education on the existing indigenous system, though considered impracticable by Lord Auckland and by the Committee of Public Instruction, was taken up by Thomason, Lieutenant-Governor of North-Western Provinces, whose plan was recommended as a model for general adoption by the Government.

The question of primary and indigenous system of education was taken up in the Despatch of 1854. Besides emphasizing on higher collegiate education, the Court of Directors expressed in this Despatch the view that "attention should now be directed to a consideration....how useful and practical knowledge, suited to every station in life, may be best conveyed to the great mass of the people". They wanted for this that "schools —whose object should be not to train highly a few youths, but to provide more opportunities than now exist for the acquisition of such an improved education as will make those who possess it more useful members of society in every condition of life—should exist in every district in India". The attention of the Government during the period from 1854 to 1871 was directed not only to the provision of education through the vernacular languages of the country but also "to the increase of schools of secondary education". There were three classes of secondary schools,—the High English Schools, the Middle English Schools and the Vernacular Schools. The Reports of the successive reviews of the progress of education in India undertaken by the Home authorities (the British Government) in 1859, 1863 and 1864 laid emphasis on the need of extending elementary education among the masses in particular. So in the period from 1871 to 1882 in which the control of education was transferred to the local Governments, the extension of secondary education was "much less marked than that of primary education, for the support and development of which local cesses had been raised in most Provinces".[86] In Bengal, the Lieutenant-Governor, Sir George Campbell, declared in a Resolution, dated 30th September, 1872, that he desired extension of education among the masses and granted for this four lakhs of rupees to make a beginning.

Between 1870-71 and 1881-82 the total number of primary schools in India (excluding Burma and Ajmer) increased from 16,473, to 82,916 or more than five-fold; while the total number of pupils increased from 607,320 to 2,061, 541 or more than threefold. Increase in schools, more than in pupils, was due chiefly to the fact that a large number of indigenous schools in Bengal were brought under the grant-in-aid system.[87] The total number of secondary schools in India increased from 3,070 in 1871 to 3,916 in 1881-82, while in the number of pupils there was a much smaller proportionate increase, that is, from 202,294 to 214,077.[88]

The extension of elementary education in England had for many years interested Ripon who took the Despatch of 1854 as his model for the expansion of education in India. The disproportionate expenditure of over 80% of the money on less than a sixth of the total number of students was obviously at variance with the policy of wide diffusion of education among all classes.[89] The Hunter Commission of 1882, referred to above, was appointed chiefly to review the working of the system and to propose ways of extending elementary education. The Commission submitted its report in October, 1883, and its thirty-six recommendations about primary education opened a new chapter in its history. "We therefore express our conviction" wrote this Commission, "that while every branch of education can justly claim the fostering care of the State, it is desirable in the present circumstances of the country, to declare the elementary education of the masses, its provision, extension, and improvement, to be the part of the educational system to which the strenuous efforts of the State should now be directed in a still larger measure than herebefore".[90] The more important of these recommendations laid down that (i) "primary education be regarded as the instruction of the masses through the vernacular in such subjects as will best fit them for their position in life, and be not necessarily regarded as a portion of instruction leading up to the University"; (2) "an attempt be made to secure the fullest possible provision for an extension of primary education by legislation suited to the circumstances of each Province"; (3) "Where indigenous schools exist, the principle of aiding and improving them be recognised as an important means of extending elementary education"; (4) "primary education be declared to be that part of the whole system of public instruction which possesses an almost exclusive claim on local funds set apart for education, and a large claim on provincial revenues"; (5) "both Municipal and Local Self-Government Boards keep a separate school-fund". There were also recommendations for inspection and supervision, encouragement of night schools wherever possible, elasticity as regards the hours of the days and the seasons of the year during which attendance of scholars is required, religious teaching, Normal schools etc.[91] With the growth of Local Self-Government after 1882, the Local Boards and Municipalities were entrusted with powers for management of schools.

VII. FEMALE EDUCATION.

The uplift of women has been one of the most significant trends of New India, and it has been furthered by progress of education among them. During the first half of the nineteenth century, some members of the aristocratic Indian families, guided chiefly by considerations of management of estates, and the Christian missionaries, prompted by religious zeal for the propagation of their faith, took interest in female education. An enlightened public opinion in favour of it was also gathering momentum, though most of the members of the orthodox sections of the community were opposed to it.[92] In fact, very little was achieved in respect of female education till the mid-nineteenth century and the Government of the East India Company remained indifferent to it though it was responsible for some other important social reforms.

Since then female education received support from different quarters, though its progress was rather slow. It received considerable impetus from the modern movements for social reforms. The women had a great defender of their rights in Raja Rammohan Roy, and the Brāhma Samāj has a record of conspicuous services for their advancement. Some prominent members of this Samāj started, from time to time, journals for promotion of education and culture among women, viz. (a) the *Bāmābodhinī*, started in 1863 and edited by Umesh-chandra Datta; (b), the *Abalābāndhava*, started about 1869 by Dwaraka-nath Ganguli; (c) the *Mahilā*, edited by Girish-chandra Sen; (d) the *Antahpura*, started by Sasipada Banerji; (e) the *Bhāratī* started by Dwijendra-nath Tagore and long edited by his accomplished sister Swarna-kumari Ghosal and her talented daughters; (f) the *Bhāratamahilā*, and (g) *Suprabhāt*, started by two graduate sisters, Kumudini and Basanti Mitra. The Ārya Samāj made arrangements for women's education through institutions like Mahākanyā Vidyālaya at Jullundur in the Panjāb, and some others started here and there. Gradually secondary and primary schools sprang up under the supervision of its branches in different parts of India. The Prārthanā Samāj and the Deccan Education Society also made important contributions to the cause of female education. The Indian Social Conference, meeting every year with the annual session of the Indian National Congress, passed resolutions advocating extension of female education.

It took several years before the Government's apathy towards female education was removed. The formation of the Hindu Bālikā Vidyālaya in Calcutta in 1849, with eleven students, due to the efforts of Hon'ble J. E. Drinkwater Bethune, Legal Member of the Governor-General's Council and President of the Council of Education, and of Pandit Īśvar-chandra Vidyāsāgar, one of the greatest educationists and social reformers of modern India, marked a turning-point in the history of female education in our country. Though many in Calcutta vehemently opposed it, Mr. Bethune received considerable support from some influential persons. The Governor-General, Lord Dalhousie, recorded in his Minute, dated the 1st April, 1850, that Mr. Bethune "has done a great work in the successful introduction of Native Female Education in India, on a sound and solid foundation; and has earned a right not only to the gratitude of the Government but to its frank and cordial support".

Sir Charles Wood's Despatch of 1854 thus remarked about female education in India in Para 83 of its Report:—"The importance of female education in India cannot be over-rated; and we have observed with pleasure the evidence which is now afforded of an increased desire on the part of many of the natives of India to give a good education to their daughters. By this means a far greater proportional impulse is imparted to the educational and moral tone of the people than by the education of men. We have already observed that schools for females are included among those to which grants-in-aid may be given, and we cannot refrain from expressing our cordial sympathy with the efforts which are being made in this direction". But the policy of the British Government in relation to female education in India was still one of caution. Lord Canning's Government declared that Government could not take such initiative in the matter of girls' education as it has done in the case of education for boys, but that such girls' schools should be supported mainly by voluntary aid, and Government might encourage the existing schools by grants-in-aids. Nevertheless, some grants were made, and in 1873 there were only one thousand six hundred and forty girls' schools of all kinds in British India.[93]

Between 1871 and 1882 there was an aggregate increase in female education in India. Large proportion of efforts was devoted to the primary education of girls as compared with their secondary or higher education. Except in Bengal, and to some degree in Madras, secondary education for girls was in the hands of Christian missionaries and 'native managers'.

After reviewing the situation about female education in India, the Education Commission of 1882 remarked that it was still in "an extremely backward condition, and that it needs to be fostered in every legitmate way". In its first out of twenty-seven recommendations touching various aspects of the problem, the Commission observed that "female education be treated as a legitimate charge alike on local, on Municipal, and on Provincial Funds and receive special encouragement". Henceforth Government grants for girls' schools began to be more liberally given and Government management more freely used than before. This helped the growth in the number of such schools and their pupils. Women were receiving University education both in men's colleges and in special female colleges. In 1901-02 there were 12 female colleges—three in Madras, three in Bengal and six in the United Provinces. The number of the female college students was by the end of that year 177 (Bengal 55, Madras 35, Bombay 30, United Provinces 49, and Burma 8). The number of secondary schools for girls was 461 and the total number of girl students both in schools for boys and girls was found to be 44,695. The great majority of them were in the primary stage, and the number in the secondary stage was about 9,800. The number of primary schools for girls was 5,628. The average number of students per school was 35 in 1901-02. "At the end of 1901-02 there were 390,000 girls in primary and secondary schools and of these all but 9,800 were in the primary stage of education."[94] Still the percentage of girls in public institutions to girls of school-going age was 2.2 in 1901-02.

VIII. PROGRESS OF EDUCATION IN DIFFERENT PROVINCES

Having reviewed the evolution of the general policy and actual schemes of education through different stages we may now proceed to describe briefly the progress of education in different provinces.

1. *BENGAL.*

The beginnings of English education in Bengal have been discussed above in Section I. **Medical and English** classes were added both to the Calcutta Madrasa (founded in 1781) and the Sanskrit College of Calcutta (founded in 1824) between 1826 and 1828. The Hindu College, to which reference has been made above, gained decided superiority over all other institutions in affording tuition in the English language and literature, and ancient and modern history. The sons of the most respectable classes of the native community of Calcutta attended this institution and paid for their education. In the report of 1827-28 the studies described were Natural and Experimental philosophy, Chemistry, Mathematics, Algebra, Tytler's Elements of General History, Russell's Modern Europe, Milton and Shakespeare. Other early colleges were Serampore College (1818), the General Assembly's Institution of the Church of Scotland founded by Dr. Duff in 1830, the Hooghli College established from the funds of the Mohsin endowment in 1838, the Institution of the Free Church of Scotland in 1843, and the Patna College in 1863.[94a] In addition to the Government colleges at Dacca, Behrampore and Krishnagar, there were also the Doveton, La Martiniere, St. Paul's private foundation, and the Bhowanipore College of the London Missionary Society.

There was a continuous feeling among the authorities after 1841 (and also indicated in the Despatch of 1854) that very little in Bengal had been done for the education of the mass of the people through the medium of their vernaculars. A few vernacular schools had been founded in Bengal in 1844, of which 33 only remained with 1400 students, whereas the comparable figures in Bombay were 216 vernacular schools with 12,000 pupils. The Council of Education, in their letter of 29 June, 1848, stressed the necessity of combining vernacular with English education, and cited North-Western Provinces as an example to be followed.[95] Men belonging mostly to the rising middle class asked why the government taught what people were not willing to learn. The Court of Directors did not feel discouraged as they had been encouraged by the success of vernacular schools in the North-Western Provinces, and the local Government in Bengal continued extending vernacular education by confining its direct action to the maintenance of model schools and by introducing the system of grant-in-aid to indigenous institutions.

The Court of Directors in their Despatch of May 12, 1847, declared that they did not regard a higher degree of scholastic knowledge as an essential qualification for the public service and valued a moderate and practical knowledge of English.[96] This Despatch shows that the process was not reversed but modified, and a critical knowledge of Bacon, Shakespeare or Milton was not necessary.

Henry Woodrow, the Inspector of the Eastern Education Division, tried to make use of the existing indigenous schools and proceeded by forming these schools into circles each comprising 3, 4 or 5 schools, and after that progress in vernacular education was sustained.[97] This method was followed and improved upon by other administrators, especially by Sir George Campbell in Bengal.

The medical classes of the Madrasa and Sanskrit College, Calcutta, were abolished from 1st February, 1835, and the Medical College was opened in June 1835. Dr. M. T. Bramley was appointed its first principal and Madhusudan Gupta made the first attempt to dissect a dead body. A secondary school in connection with the college for the instruction of native doctors for the military and civil branches of the service was established in 1839. The first hospital was opened in 1838 and a female hospital began to function in 1841. In March, 1844, four students went to England for training in medical science. The sanction for the opening of an engineering college was received from the Court of Directors on 19th September, 1855. The college was opened in November, 1856, at the Writers' Building, Calcutta and in 1880 it was replaced by Government Engineering College at Sibpur. In 1842 the appointment of a Professor of Law in Hindu College was sanctioned, and a course of lectures was delivered by the Advocate-General, J. E. Lyall. The law class was organized from the beginning of the session of 1855. On the establishment of the Calcutta University in 1857, University examinations for the Licentiate and the Degree of Bachelor of Law were instituted and the number of colleges teaching law was 16 in 1903-4.

In 1857, 10 Arts Colleges were affiliated to the Calcutta University. By 1902, the Calcutta University had 46 first-grade and 32 second-grade collegiate institutions affiliated to it.[98] The Degree of M.A. was conferred for the first time in 1862 and that of Bachelor of Science in 1901-2. In 1903-4 the number attending secondary schools was 4.4 per cent. of the boys of school-going age and 122 primary schools were maintained wholly by the Education Department. The number of children attending schools represented 16.5 per cent. of the total population of school-going age in 1903-4.[99]

The promotion of female education was the work of individual and private Societies and was not recognised as a branch of the States' system of education until 1854. The Calcutta School Society had female education as one of its objects. But the first real attempt to instruct Bengali girls was made by the Calcutta Female Juvenile Society which came to be known subsequently as the Ladies Society for Native Female Education. Mrs. Wilson, whose services were engaged by the Corresponding Committee of the Church Missionary Society, had 30 schools in 1826 which were formed into a Central school in 1829. Other schools sprang up due to the efforts of the London Church Missionary Society. In May, 1849, Bethune opened a female school at Calcutta to which he donated a sum of £10,000 and this institution was recognised by the government. At first only 11 pupils joined this school but by April 11, 1850, the number had risen to 35. The example set by Bethune was followed by others in Bengal, and Dalhousie regarded female education as the beginning of a great revolution in Indian habits. The number of Arts colleges and schools for girls rose from 831 in 1881 to 5005 in 1904. The percentage of girls under instruction to the number of school-going age was 0.87 in 1880-81 and 2.8 in 1903-4. The Bethune College, La Martiniere, and Loretto House were prominent institutions.

2. *BOMBAY*

In Bombay the number of Europeans was small and their connections with local people were recent and less intimate than they were in Bengal. In 1815 the Bombay Native Education Society was formed and opened three schools in Bombay, Thana and Broach. Mountstuart Elphinstone extended the Society's operations to supplying vernacular and school book literature. The Society recommended the adoption of the Lancasterian method[100] of teaching and continued its work til 1840, when it became the Board of Education, which devoted itself to the improvement of teaching. In 1820 was formed a special committee for native education called the 'Native School and School Book Committee', the object of which was to raise funds for the purpose of education. The Poona Sanskrit College was opened by Mr. Willam Chaplin on 6th October, 1821, for the encouragement of thestudy of Sanskrit and of ancient Hindu literature and sciences.[10] The scope of this college was widened and it was later known as the Deccan College. In 1823 the Court of Directors rebuked theBombay Government for having set up the Poona College and though they allowed the Poona College to continue, they firmly rejected the Bombay College plan. The Society's central school in Bombay proved more successful and remained the principal Government high school. When Mr. Elphinstone left in 1827, the native gentlemen subscribed, as a memorial to him, £21,600, from the interest on which professorships were to be established, the incumbents to be recruited from Great Britain until "natives shall be competent to hold them". No such professors arrived till 1835.[102] The classes were held in the Town Hall and provided the nucleus for Elphinstone College.[103] The Wilson College, originally called the General Assembly's Institution, was founded as a high school in 1834. By 1850 there were only eight schools subordinate to the Board of Education throughout the Bombay Presidency. The monthly fee of Elphinstone Institution was Re. 1/- whereas in Hindu College, Calcutta, students paid as much as Rs. 8/-.[104]

In Bombay the emphasis from the very beginning was on the diffusion of Western knowledge through the vernaculars. Mountstuart Elphinstone, a liberal, if not a radical, was deeply interested in the education of the masses in Benthamite terms[105], and although there were conflicting claims between English and the vernaculars, Elphinstone's view in favour of the latter received the approbation of the Court of Directors. Malcolm followed Elphinstone and differed from Warden as to the mode of diffusing education. And though later, men like Edward Perry and Col. Jervis debated the same problem—'English vs. Vernaculars'—the Government of Bombay in their letter of 5th April, 1848, gave preference to 'native languages' in so far as general education of the people was concerned.[106] The immediate occasion for the controversy between Col. Jervis and Perry was a proposal to give instruction in civil engineering through the medium of vernaculars.[107] Jervis suggested that the instruction should be through the language of the people whereas E. Perry's view was that superior branches of education could be imparted only through the medium of English.[108] The Government of Bombay in their letter to the Board of Education, dated 5th April, 1848, gave a decided preference to the views of those who advocated the use of vernaculars for the diffusion of knowledge. That did not mean that there was no desire to acquire a knowledge of English language and literature, and while the vernacular education was languishing in Bengal, in Bombay it was making rapid progress. In contrast to Calcutta, there were 216 vernacular schools under the Board of Education with 12,000 students.

In October 1845, the Grant Medical College was formally opened, and the first regular session began on 16th June, 1846. The Sir Jamsetjee Jeejeebhoy Hospital began as 'the school of practice' of the Grant Medical College, which received recognition from the Royal College of Surgeons in England in 1854. An Engineering Institution was in existence in Bombay in 1824. To no branch of education did Malcolm look forward to with more sanguine expectations than the Engineers' Institution in Bombay Presidency.[109] A class for training engineers was opened in the Elphinstone Institution in 1844, but for want of suitable candidates for admission the class was broken up in 1847. The nucleus of a college of civil engineering existed in the Poona-Engineering Class and Mechanical Class. The Poona College of Science grew out of an engineering school founded in 1854. In 1847 Sir Edward Perry, President of the Board of Education, advocated the institution of a law class at the Elphinstone Institution. In 1855 a professorship was founded on endowment subscribed in honour of Sir Edward Perry. Two other professorships were sanctioned later. The Government maintained model schools at the headquarters of each district. The Grant Medical College, the Elphinstone, Wilson, Deccan, St. Xaviers' and Fergusson were the principal colleges. By 1902 Bombay had 10 first-grade colleges and only one second-grade college.[110] Of the male population of school-going age, 19.8% attended public primary schools in 1903-4.

The American Missionary Society, which did the pioneering work in female education, established the first native girls' school in Bombay Presidency in 1824, and two years later they reported an increase of 9 girls' schools. One of these institutions was a Boarding School, maintained at Byculla in the island of Bombay. In 1831, two native schools in Ahmadnagar were established by the same mission. The first of many female schools of Mrs. Wilson was opened in December, 1829. During 1829-30 Dr. and Mrs. Wilson established six schools. The Church Missionary Society established its first school in 1826. Other female schools were established at Thana, Bassein and Nasik. And there was a substantial increase of Normal schools and Elementary schools by the seventies of the last century.[111] In 1903-4, 4.74% of the female population of school-going age attended schools. In both male and female populations, the Parsis took the lead.

3. *MADRAS.*

The missionaries were the first to open schools in the Madras Presidency. Protestant Mission Schools were established at Madras, Cuddalore, Tanjore and Trichinopoly. In 1787, the Court of Directors authorised a permanent annual grant for the support of three schools. Mr. Hugh's Chaplin, a missionary in Palamkotta, opened two schools in 1817 with the support of the Madras Corresponding Committee of the Church Missionary Society. Sir Thomas Munro was a strong believer in the good effect of education. He restored funds which had been diverted due to political instability. It was Munro's Minute of 25th June, 1822, which first suggested the idea of conducting a statistical inquiry into the state of education. According to Munro the means of dispelling ignorance in India was the endowment of schools throughout the country by Government with a moderate allowance secured to teachers which would place them above want. Munro wanted to give inducements both to teachers and to students for furthering education, and he wished to establish in each Collectorate two principal schools.

The Madras Book Society played an important part and the Court of Directors desired that measures for giving instruction in English language and literature should be adopted.[112] The Board of Public Instruction was reconstituted in 1836 as the Committee of Native Education which in turn gave place in 1841 to a University Board. This was superseded by a Council of Education in 1845, which was finally dissolved at the instance of the Court of Directors in 1847. The Department of Public Instruction was formed in 1854. By 1852 there was only a single institution in the Presidency, founded by or under the immediate control of the Government. But Missionary enterprise had been particularly active. The Collectorate and Tehsildari schools, with elementary instruction through the vernacular along with a little English in a few of them, had continued, but as a result of Bentinck's Resolution, they were abolished in 1836.

There were differences of opinion between the Board and the members of the Governor's Council on educational policy, and in more cases than one, the Court of Directors also negatived the schemes put forward by authorities in India. A balance of over Rs. 3 lakhs had been accumulated,[113] and it was not until June, 1853, that the first Government school outside Madras city was founded at Cuddalore and another at Rajahmundry. Lord Elphinstone in his Minute of 12th December, 1839, recommended the establishment of a collegiate institution at Madras. In February, 1853, the Government formally sanctioned the immediate establishment of a Collegiate Department, designated as the Madras University.[114] The first report of the Director of Public Instruction (1854-55) shows that with the exception of the sum spent on elementary schools in a few places, the operations of the Government were confined to the collegiate institution under the designation of the University of Madras, and to the two Provincial schools at Rajahmundry and Cuddalore. A few more Provincial schools at Bellary, Calicut etc. were later established. The Court of Directors in their Despatch of 1854 lamented that very little had been done by the Government of Madras for the masses, and it was only the activities of the Christian missionaries that had been successful among the Tamil population. The example of North-Western Provinces was cited for giving impetus to vernacular education. The Court, in their Despatch of 30th December, 1842, recorded that the University students at Madras were inferior both in number and proficiency to those of Bombay and Bengal, and recommended the formation of a Normal School. In their Despatch of 1859 they suggested that the High School of Madras should be remodelled and formed into an institution somewhat resembling the Presidency College, Calcutta. Furthermore, they lamented the less advanced state of education throughout the Madras Presidency, and recommended that Woodrow's plan should be followed for the improvement of the existing village schools.

In Madras the foundation of colleges began much later. The General Assembly's institution, known as the Christian College, was founded in 1837. In 1841 the Central school was converted into a high school; in 1853 a college department was added to it, and later it developed into the Presidency College. St. Joseph's College was established at Negapatam in 1846 by the Jesuits in charge of the Madura Mission. Medical classes were started at the Madras Medical School, and in 1851 the institution was raised to the status of a college. The Presidency College, the Madras Christian College, Pachayyappa's College, the Jesuit and S.P.G. Colleges at Trichinopoly, and St. Peter's College at Tanjore were the principal colleges. In 1904 one boy in every five of school-going age attended primary classes, and one boy in every forty-five of school-going age, secondary classes. By 1902 Madras had 15 first-grade and 39 second-grade colleges.[115] The education of girls was begun by the missionaries. On 17th October, 1821, it was resolved to form native girls' schools in Madras,[116] but it was not until 1866 that Government started its own schools for them. In 1904 the percentage of girls under instruction to the population of school-going age was 4.8.

The first attempt to train teachers in India was made by Dr. Andrew Bell at the end of the eighteenth century and his system (sometimes called the Madras System) was adopted in Europe and America.

4. *UTTAR PRADESH (UNITED PROVINCES)*

The oldest college in U.P., the Sanskrit College at Banaras, was founded in 1791 "to cultivate the laws, literature and religion of the Hindus", and "especially to supply qualified Hindu assistants to European judges". The college at Agra was established in 1823, and at Delhi an Oriental college was founded in 1825. English was introduced in Delhi college in 1828. The Allahabad School was opened in 1834. The college at Bareilly arose in 1850 out of a high school founded in 1836. Canning College was founded at Lakhnau in 1864 by the *talukdars* of Avadh in grateful memory of the generous treatment they received from Lord Canning after the Mutiny.

The control of the educational institutions in North-Western Provinces was transferred from the Government of Bengal to the Local Government together with the funds belonging to the colleges at Banaras, Agra and Delhi, by a Resolution of the Supreme Government, dated 29th April, 1840. At that time there were three colleges and nine Anglo-Vernacular schools maintained by Government. In this Province a completely new development took place. Mr. James Thomason, Lieutenant-Governor of the North-Western Provinces, took up the idea of Adam's vernacular education in 1843, brought it closer to the reality of agricultural life, and made it the whole basis of general education in this Province. He displayed accurate knowledge of the conditions and the requirements of the people under his charge, and provided honourable inducements to his subjects for gaining elementary knowledge so that their own rights might be preserved. The necessity for registering land offered him an opportunity which he turned to good account. A peasant naturally had suffered much due to his ignorance and Mr. Thomason made people realize that elementary knowledge of reading, writing, arithmetic and agricultural accounts was indispensable for the preservation of their legitimate rights. His conception of education was not confined to the narrow wants of higher classes, but embraced the whole population, especially the peasantry. He had in him the sympathetic outlook and comprehensive vision of Thomas Munro, and as compared with Bengal, there was less encouragement for the study of English.[117] The Local Government decided to introduce education through the medium of vernaculars and thus there began the multiplication and improvement of village schools by supervision, advice and distribution of elementary books,—the kind of policy which Munro, and later on Adam, had suggested. But though the Court of Directors objected to incidental points like that of the grant of *Jāgīr*, both the Court and the Local Government sanctioned as an experimental measure the establishment of *Tehsildari* schools in eight districts.

A Model School was established by Mr. Thomason at the headquarter of each *Tehsildar*, and for meeting the requirements of the agricultural people the system of *Halkabandi*[118] was introduced. The system worked on the basis that the peasantry was the real backbone of the country, that their rights should be preserved, and that they should be encouraged to improve themselves. Adam's Reports had contemplated the endowment of a school in every village, and Thomason, in his revised scheme of 19th April, 1848, asked for authority to introduce his scheme of vernacular education in eight districts which might involve an expense not exceeding Rs. 13,000 per annum, while one Government school in each *Tehsil* was to serve as a model to the village school master. Eight districts were selected, and the experiment was an eminent success. Dalhousie, in his Minute of 25th October, 1853, paid a great compliment to the scheme of vernacular schools[119] and was prepared to extend the system. Though Mr. Thomason died on the 29th September, 1853, Dalhousie recommended to the Court of Directors that fullest sanction should be given to the extension of the scheme of vernacular education in all districts within the jurisdiction of North-Western Provinces.[120] The successful scheme was held up as an example to other Governments.

F. J. Mouat, in his report of June 4, 1853,[121] paid a great compliment to vernacular education in North-Western Provinces, which he thought was decidedly better than the instruction in any vernacular school that he had seen in Bengal. Students answered questions on geography, statistics and topographical features, and Dr. Mouat spoke highly of the extent of scientific instruction communicated at the Delhi College through treatises in Urdu.[122] Mr. H. R. Reid became in 1855 the first Director of Public Instruction. His first and second reports refer to his experiment of *Halkabandi* schools which flourished in the North-Western Provinces in thousands. This idea originated about 1851 in an experiment made by Mr. Alexander, Collector of Mathura, and taken up by other Collectors, so that by the close of 1854 there were about 17,000 pupils receiving education in them.

The early instruction in engineering is connected with the Thomason Engineering College at Roorkee. In 1845, a small engineering class was held at Saharanpur. In 1847 the vigorous prosecution of the scheme of the Ganges Canal was determined upon, and the Thomason Engineering College at Roorkee was a product of this engineering scheme. In 1849 the institution was placed on a permanent footing, and in 1854 the name of Thomason was associated with it. The institution had 371 students in 1903-4, when certificates of proficiency were given by the college. University education commenced in 1860 with the affiliations of colleges to the Calcutta University, and in 1872 the Muir Central College was founded. Sir Syed Ahmad Khan founded a school at Aligarh in 1875 which was raised to the status of a college in 1878. The Allahabad University was constituted in 1887. The number of Arts Colleges was 16 in 1891 and 28 in 1901-4. In 1904 the number of secondary schools for boys was 508 and the number of scholars 17,827. The number of primary schools in 1904 was 8,070 and of pupils, 330,387. The proportion of the population of school-going age under instruction increased from

3.4% in 1881 to 7% in 1904. Between 1891 and 1901 the proportion in secondary schools increased from 1.4 to 1.8%, while in primary schools there was an increase from 4.1% to 7.1%. By 1902 the Allahabad University had 17 first and 13 second grade colleges.[123]

At Agra, Gopal Singh, the Deputy Inspector of Schools, encouraged the cause of female education in 1855. In 1857 the number of schools rose to 288, and then the system was extended to Mathura and other places. In 1901 the number of female institutions was 637 and of pupils, 21,314.

5. *THE PANJĀB*

Before the Panjāb was made a British Province in 1849, Government schools existed in Delhi territory, which then formed a part of the North-Western Provinces. After the annexation, the Christian Missions, especially the American Presbyterian missionaries and the Church of England Communion, established schools. The Administration Report of 1849-50 indicates that the Sikh prejudices were dying out and that the Panjāb was ripe for the introduction of some educational scheme.[124] Many noblemen and gentlemen were anxious to acquire the knowledge of English. The Government followed the example of the missionaries, and district officers, like Col. Abbot, Captain Blair Reid, Edward Paske, Major Brown, and Richard Temple founded schools in their districts. In January, 1856, W. D. Arnold was appointed Director of Public Instruction, and drew up a scheme on the basis of North-Western Provinces, cost being met out of 1% cess on the land revenue which was being levied at the time in most of the districts. The *Halkabandi* system of North-Western Provinces was adopted, though English was to be taught to those who were willing to pay for it. Due to insufficiency of income to meet the entire cost of the maintenance of the schools, the scheme met with only partial success in the beginning. It was accordingly resolved to reduce the number of schools to raise the efficiency of the remainder. The policy of Sir Charles Aitchison was followed. The aim was the improvement of indigenous schools without destroying their distinctive character by the offer of liberal grants-in-aid. Normal schools, *Tehsildari* schools and Zilla schools were established, and the curriculum was improved. The first female school was opened in Rawalpindi in December 1856, and by the close of the year 17 schools were established. In 1862, Sir Robert Montgomery enlisted public support for female education, but it was only in 1885-6 that a sound system of female education was laid, and there began the steady increase of private enterprise on behalf of female education. In 1864 Government colleges were established at Lahore and Delhi. In 1870 Sir Donald Mecleod inaugurated the new Punjab University College, which was established in part fulfilment of the demands by a large number of the chiefs, nobles and influential classes of the Panjāb. By Act XIX of 1882, the Punjab (formerly Lahore) University College was incorporated as the University of the Punjab, the primary object of which was the revival of Eastern learning and the creation of good vernacular literature, though English was still to be considered as the natural complement of education. Prior to the foundation of the University, colleges were affiliated to the Calcutta University. Lahore Medical College, established in October 1860, was raised to collegiate status in 1870. The law school at Lahore was founded in 1870. The Lahore Central Training College, which provided trained teachers, was opened in 1881. In 1883-4 there were only three colleges; Government and Oriental colleges at Lahore and St. Stephens' College at Delhi. The engineering class of the Punjab University was started before 1886. In 1888 the Dayanand Anglo-Vedic School, established by the Ārya Samāj, was raised to the status of a college. The Islamia College at Lahore was opened in 1892, and the Khalsa College was founded at Amritsar in 1897. By 1889-90 the number of Arts colleges had risen to 7 and that of matriculation candidates to 1,016. In 1900-1 the number of Arts colleges was 12 with 2,948 Matriculation candidates and 1,214 passes. By 1902, the Punjab University had 8 colleges of the first and 7 of the second grade.[125] The percentage of males in British districts, able to read and write, was 6.8 according to the Census of 1901, and that of females, 0.37.

6. *CHIEFS' COLLEGES*

Chiefs' Colleges in India were the growth entirely of the second half of the 19th century. They were founded on English lines and were designed to provide education for the princely and aristocratic families of India.[126] The first of these colleges to be started was the Rajkumar College at Rajkot in 1870. In 1872 Mayo College was founded in Ajmere in memory of Lord Mayo. In 1872 Rajkumar College was opened at Nowgong, which was amalgamated with Daly College at Indore in 1898. In 1876 a special class was opened in the Indore Residency School for the sons of the native chiefs on the western side of Central India, and it received later the designation of Daly College in memory of the political officer, Sir Henry Daly. The Aitchison College at Lahore was founded in 1886. The Arts College at Jaipur dates from 1873, and the Arts College at Jodhpur was established in 1893. For the education of the sons of the gentry, the principal schools were Colvin School at Lakhnau (for the sons of the Avadh *Talukdars)*, the Raipur College (for the sons of the Chattisgarh chiefs), and the Girasia colleges at Gondal and Wadhwan in Kathiawar.

IX. MUSLIM EDUCATION.

As mentioned above, the attitude of the members of the Muhammadan community in India towards Western education was at first one of aversion and opposition. There was among them a general aptitude and inclination towards classical studies in Arabic and Persian, and many among them did not like an exotic system introduced by an alien ruling authority which had displaced the lingering vestige of Mughul supremacy. Soon after the introduction of English education in India, the Council of Education stated that the "endeavour to impart a high order of English education" to the Muhammadan community had failed completely. There was no improvement in the situation for many years in respect of higher education, though the numerical strength of the Muhammadan students in schools had gradually increased.

The backwardness of the Muhammadan population in respect of higher education, as compared with the members of the other community, attracted the attention of the Government of Lord Mayo, and by its Resolution of 7th August, 1871, it drew the attention of the different Local Governments and Administrations to the subject. The Reports[127] from the Local Governments and Administrations, in reply to this Resolution, were considered by the Government of Lord Northbrook in a Resolution, dated 13th June, 1873.[128] After reviewing the measures adopted by the respective Local Governments for encouragement of education among Muhammadans Lord Northbrook's Resolution recorded the view that "the Earl of Mayo's Resolution had succeeded in its main purpose of drawing attention of all Administrations to needs and obligations which before had, perhaps, not everywhere been adequately realized," and suggested certain measures for the spread of education among the Muhammadans.

The Education Commission of 1882 also reviewed the subject of Muhammadan education in India, and made important recommendations in this respect, some of which were as follows:—(1). "That the special encouragement of Muhammadan education be regarded as a legitimate charge on Local, on Municipal and on Provincial Funds; (2). "That Higher English Education for Muhammadans, being the kind of education in which that community needs special help, be liberally encouraged"; (3). "That where necessary, a graduated system of special scholarships for Muhammadans be established" for award in schools and colleges; (4).

"That in all classes of schools maintained from public funds, a certain proportion of free studentships be expressly reserved for Muhammadan students"; and (5) "That Associations for the promotion of Muhammadan education be recognised and encouraged".

With regard to the recommendations of the Commission relating to this matter, the Government of India observed in a Resolution, dated the 23rd October, 1884: "The Governor-General in Council has the subject of Muḥammadan education at present under separate consideration, and will merely say here that, in view of the backward condition into which in some Provinces members of that community have fallen, he thinks it desirable to give them in some respects exceptional assistance". Another declaration of policy on this subject was previously made by the Government of India in a Resolution, dated the 15th July, 1883, after consideration of the view-points placed in a Memorial addressed to Lord Ripon in February, 1882, by the National Muhammadan Association of Calcutta together with other relevant papers. The main points in July 1883 Resolution were as follows:—(1). "The Muhammadans cannot hope fairly to hold their own in respect of the better description of State appointments but by frankly placing themselves in line with the Hindus, and taking full advantage of the Government system of high and specially of English education"; (2). A special section should be devoted to Muhammadan education in the Annual Reports of Public Instructions; (3). "For the attraction of Muhammadans to higher education, a liberal provision of scholarships is essential and their wants must not be overlooked in the framing of any general scheme of scholarship for any Province"; (4). "Special Muhammadan Inspecting Officers to inspect and enquire into Muhammadan education generally, may be appointed in places where the Muhammadans are very backward".[129]

In the meanwhile a momentous step had been taken by an eminent Muhammadan of liberal and progressive outlook. He was Sir Syed Ahmad, to whom the Muhammadan community of India owes a heavy debt for their advancement. He, with his foresighted vision, realized the need of modern education for the progress of his co-religionists: With the zeal of a reformer, and by defying all opposition, he established the Anglo-Oriental College at Aligarh, which later developed into a University as an important centre of higher education, particularly for the Muslims in India.[130]

In 1881-8 the percentage of Muhammadan students of India receiving English education in colleges was 3.6 in proportion to the total number of students in such institutions, and that of Muhammadan students in High and English Schools was 9.2,[131] though the percentage of Muhammadans to the population of the different Provinces was 22.8. There was no appreciable progress of Muhammadan education during the next fifteen years. During the period from 1858 to 1893 "only 546 Muhammadans succeeded in obtaining University Degrees in the various branches of learning, as against no less than 15,081 Hindus, yielding a proportion of only three-and-a-half per cent. in the total number of Hindu and Muhammadan graduates, and an yearly average of 15.1, as against 418.9 Hindus or a proportion of 1 to 28 of the average number of Hindu graduates per year"[132] The percentage of Muhammadans among pupils of all creeds under public instruction was 19.2 in 1891-92 and 19.3 in 1896-97, but went down to 18.8 in 1901-02. This loss was in the primary Schools, and there was a slight increase in the number of Muhammadan students in Arts Colleges and Secondary Schools.[133]

APPENDIX[134]

CONTROVERSY BETWEEN THE "ORIENTALISTS" AND "ANGLICISTS" AND MACAULAY'S MINUTE ON THE SAME.

The difference between the two opposing parties has been summed up thus:—

'Half of the Committee, called the "Orientalists", were for the continuation of the old system of stipends, tenable for twelve or fifteen years, to students of Arabic and Sanskrit, and for liberal expenditure on the publication of works in these languages. The other half, called the "Anglicists," desired to reduce the expenditure on stipends held by "lazy and stupid schoolboys of 30 and 35 years of age" and to cut down the sums lavished on Sanskrit and Arabic printing. At this juncture, Government requested the Committee to prepare a scheme of instruction for a college at Agra. The Committee were utterly unable to agree on any plan. Five members were in favour of Arabic, Persian, and Sanskrit learning, and five in favour of English and the vernacular, with just so much of the Oriental learned languages as would be necessary to satisfy local prejudices'.

Macaulay, on arriving in India, was appointed President of this Committee, but he refused to act as such until the Governor-General had decided upon the language of instruction. In his capacity of Legislative member of the Governor-General's Council, however, he was neither diffident nor inactive, and when the question was brought before the Council by the rival parties, who addressed their arguments in the form of letters, dated 21st and 22nd January, 1835, respectively, he expressed his views on the matter in dispute in a masterly Minute, dated 2nd February of that year, and from which we quote the following paragraphs, as it is impossible to describe the points in dispute in clearer or more expressive language:—

"It does not appear to me that the Act of Parliament can by any art of construction be made to bear the meaning which has been assigned to it. It contains nothing about the particular languages or sciences which are to be studied...

"The admirers of the Oriental system of education have used another argument which, if we admit it to be valid, is decisive against all change. They conceive that the public faith is pledged to the present system, and that to alter the appropriation of any of the funds which have hitherto been spent in encouraging the study of Arabic and Sanskrit would be downright spoliation. It is not easy to understand by what process of reasoning they can have arrived at this conclusion. The grants which are made from the public purse for the encouragement of literature differ in no respect from the grants which are made from the same purse for other objects of real or supposed utility. We found a sanatorium on a spot which we suppose to be healthy. Do we thereby pledge ourselves to keep a sanatorium there if the result should not answer our expectations? We commence the erection of a pier. Is it a violation of the public faith to stop the works if we afterwards see reason to believe that the building will be useless? The rights of property are undoubtedly sacred. But nothing endangers those rights so much as the practice now unhappily too common of attributing them to things to which they do not belong.....

"All the parties seem to be agreed on one point, that the dialects commonly spoken among the natives of this part of India contain neither literary nor scientific information, and are moreover so poor and rude that until they are enriched from some other quarter it will not be easy to translate any valuable work into them. It seems to be admitted on all sides that the intellectual improvement of those classes of the people who have the means of pursuing higher studies can at present be effected only by means of some language not vernacular amongst them. What then shall that language be? One half of the Committee maintain that it should be English. The other half strongly recommend Arabic and Sanskrit. The whole question seems to me to be which language is the best worth knowing? I have no knowledge of either Sanskrit or Arabic. But I have done what I could to form a correct estimate of their value. I have read translations of the most celebrated Arabic and Sanskrit works. I have conversed both here and at home with men distinguished by their proficiency in the eastern tongues. I am quite ready to take the Oriental learning at the valuation of the Orientalists themselves.

I have never found one among them who could deny that a single shelf of a good European library was worth the whole native literature of India and Arabia. The intrinsic superiority of the Western literature is indeed fully admitted by those members of the Committee who support the Oriental plan of education. It will hardly be disputed, I suppose, that the department of literature in which the Eastern writers stand highest is poetry. And I certainly never met with any Orientalists who ventured to maintain that the Arabic and Sanskrit poetry could be compared to that of the great European nations. But when we pass from works of imagination to works in which facts are recorded and general principles investigated the superiority of the Europeans becomes absolutely immeasurable. It is, I believe, no exaggeration to say that all the historical information which has been collected from all the books written in the Sanskrit language is less valuable than what may be found in the most paltry abridgments used at preparatory schools in England. In every branch of physical or moral philosophy the relative position of the two nations is nearly the same.

"How then stands the case? We have to educate a people who cannot at present be educated by means of their mother tongue. We must teach them some foreign language. The claims of our own language it is hardly necessary to recapitulate. It stands pre-eminent even among the languages of the West. It abounds with works of imagination not inferior to the noblest which Greece has bequeathed to us; with models of every species of eloquence; with historical compositions which considered merely as narratives have seldom been surpassed, and which considered as vehicles of ethical and political instruction have never been equalled; with just and lively representations of human life and human nature; with the most profound speculation on metaphysics, morals, government, jurisprudence, and trade; with full and correct information respecting every experimental science which tends to preserve the health, to increase the comfort, or to expand the intellect of man. Whoever knows that language has ready access to all the vast intellectual wealth which all the wisest nations of the earth have created and hoarded in the course of ninety generations. It may safely be said that the literature now extant in that language is of far greater value than all the literature which 300 years ago was extant in all the languages of the world together. Nor is this all. In India English is the language spoken by the ruling class. It is spoken by the higher class of natives at the seats of Government. It is likely to become the language of commerce throughout the seas of East. It is the language of two great European communities which are rising, the one in the south of Africa, the other in Australasia; communities which are every year becoming more important and more closely connected with our Indian Empire. Whether we look at the intrinsic value of our literature or at the particular situation of this country we shall see the strongest reason to think that of all foreign tongues the English tongue is that which would be the most useful to our native subjects.

"The question now before us is simply whether, when it is in our power to teach this language, we shall teach languages in which by universal confession there are no books on any subject which deserve to be compared to our own; whether, when we can teach European science, we shall teach systems which by universal confession whenever they differ from those of Europe differ for the worse; and whether, when we can patronise sound philosophy and true history, we shall countenance at the public expense medical doctrines which would disgrace an English farrier, astronomy which would move laughter in girls at an English Boarding-School, history abounding with kings thirty feet high and reigns 30,000 years long, and geography made up of seas of treacle and seas of butter... The languages of Western Europe civilised Russia. I cannot doubt that they will do for the Hindu what they have done for the Tartar....

"It is said that Sanskrit and Arabic are the languages in which the sacred books of a hundred millions of people are written, and that they are on that account entitled to peculiar encouragement. Assuredly it is the duty of the British Government in India to be not only tolerant but neutral on all religious questions. But to encourage the study of a literature admitted to be of small intrinsic value, only because that literature inculcates the most serious errors on the most important subjects, is a course hardly reconcilable with reason, with morality, or even with that very neuturality which ought, as we all agree, to be sacredly pursued. It is confessed that a language is barren of useful knowledge. We are to teach it because it is fruitful of monstrous superstitions. We are to teach false history, false astronomy, false medicine, because we find them in company with a false religion. We abstain, and I trust shall always abstain, from giving any public encouragement to those who are engaged in the work of converting natives to Christianity. And while we act thus can we reasonably and decently bribe men out of the revenues of the state to waste their youth in learning how they are to purify themselves after touching an ass, or what text of the Vedas they are to repeat to expiate the crime of killing a goat? ....

"To sum up what I have said. I think it is clear that we are not fettered by any pledge expressed or implied; that we are free to employ our funds as we choose; that we ought to employ them in teaching what is best worth knowing; that English is better worth knowing than Sanskrit or Arabic; that the natives are desirous to be taught English. and are not desirous to be taught Sanskrit or Arabic; that neither as the languages of law nor as the languages of religion have Sanskrit and Arabic any peculiar claim to our encouragement; that it is possible to make natives of this country thoroughly good English scholars, and that to this end our efforts ought to be directed."

---

1. Heber, I. 188-9; II. 78.
2. For a detailed account of this Society, cf. *BPP*, LXXVIII, Part I (Jan.-June, 1959), pp. 30 ff.
3. For a full account, with references, cf. *JAS*, Letters, XXXI. 39 ff.
4. *Sketches*, III. 91.
5. Andrews and Mookerjee, 70-1.
6. Heber, III. 360.
7. *Works*, 472.
8. Ibid, 474.
9. B.N. Banerji, III. 236-7.
10. Ibid, II. 44-5.
11. Griffiths, 245.
12. B.N. Banerji, III. 9-10.
13. Ibid, I. 42.
14. B. Majumdar, 81-2.
15. Ibid, 82.
16. Ibid, 79-80.
17. Ibid, 83.
18. Ibid, 86.
19. Ibid, 107-8.
20. Helevy, *A History of the English People in 1815*, p 448; Coupland, *Wilberforce*, pp. 32, 51.
21. This treatise is incorporated in the Parliamentary Papers (1831-2), Vol. VIII, App. 1, p. 3. See also, for Grant's influence, William Ward, *A view of the History, Life and Religion of the Hindus*, Vol. III, p. 398. The *Calcutta Review* (XIX, 1848, pp. 244-45) gives a fair though brief estimate of Charles Grant. See also Teignmouth, *Memoir of the Life and Writing and Correspondence of Sir William Jones*, p. 46.
22. See for Grant's observations, Parliamentary Papers, op. cit., p. 60.
23. Hansard, 1813, Vol. XXVI, p. 858. For Charles Grant's view see Ibid., pp. 449-50, and for John Shore, see Lord Teignmouth, *Considerations on the Practicability, Policy and Obligation of Communicating to the Natives of India the knowledge of Christianity* (London, 1808), especially pp. 81, 101.
24. Parliamentary Papers (1831-32), IX, p. 484. See Minto's Minute dated 6 March, 1811, in Sharp Selections, pp. 19-21.
25. Parliamentary Papers (1831-32), IX, 436, Despatch to the Government of Bengal.
26. Ibid, 437.
27. *Selections from Official Letters and Documents relating to the Life of Raja Ram Mohan Roy*, Calcutta 1938, p. LXI.
28. *Calcutta Review*, XLV, 1867, p. 318.
29. Parliamentary Papers (1831-32), IX, p. 445. See also the earlier report of 1825, p. 436. Despatch to India and Bengal, 16 April, 1834, India and Bengal Despatches, I.O.R., pp. 898-914.
30. F.J. Shore, *Notes on Indian Affairs*, Vol. I, London 1837, p. 395.
31. Spear, "Bentinck and Education", *Cambridge Historical Journal*, Vol. VI, No. 1, Cambridge 1938, p. 81.
32. See Bentinck MSS. (Nottingham University), Ellenborough, President, Board of Control, to Bentinck, 23 September, 1830.
33. Bentinck MSS., Astell to Bentinck, 4th October, 1830.
34. Trevelyan, *On the Education of the People of India*, pp. 146-48, (Extract from a letter from the Secretary in the Persian Department, in the Committee of

Public Instruction, dated the 26th June, 1829). Parliamentary Papers, Letter in the Public Department to Bengal, 29th September, 1830, p. 497.

35. Ibid.
36. Bowring, John, *The Works of Jeremy Bentham*. Bentham to Col. Young, 28 December, 1827, Works, Vol. X, pp. 576-8.
37. Bentham MSS., Folder No. 22, Box No. 10.
38. V.N. Datta, Evidence of Unpublished Documents on William Bentinck's Administrative Ideas, in *PIHC*, XXXIV, 1958, pp. 153-57. esp. p. 155.
39. See in particular, Bentinck MSS. Dissent against letter to Supreme Government authorising British subjects to hold land in India on a lease of twenty-one years.
40. Bentinck MSS. Bentinck to Metcalfe, 16 September, 1829. His bias in favruo of English is mentioned in the *Calcutta Review*, Vol. I, 1844, 'Lord William Bentinck-Administration'. See also Geoffrey Seed, William Bentinck and the Reform of Education, *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1952, pp. 66-77.
41. Bentinck MSS., Bentinck to Mancy, 1 June, 1834.
42. V.N. Datta, Evidence of Unpublished Documents on C.E. Trevelyan's views on education. *PIHRC*, XXXV, Part II, 1959, pp. 77-78.
43. V.N. Datta, Evidence of Unpublished Documents of C.E. Trevelyan, op. cit., p. 80.
44. See Spear, *JIH* (1940), p. 104.
45. Bentinck Manuscripts, E. Ryan to Bentinck, 18th February, 1835.
46. For Macaulay's role see Percival Spear, Bentinck and Education, *The Cambridge Historical Journal*, Vol. VI, No. 1, Cambridge 1938. See also G.O. Trevelyan, *Life of Macaulay*, p. 56. Part of Macaulay's Minute is quoted in the Appendix.
47. Duncan Forbes, *The Cambridge Journal* (October) 1951, p. 23. For Benthamite influence on Macaulay, see Eric Stokes, *The English Utilitarians and India*, Oxford 1959, pp. 191-2 and 320-21.

47a. Cf. O'Malley, p. 149.

47b. Orders from Home were not received until 1841.

47c. Revenue, Judicial and Legislative Committee, Miscellaneous Papers 9. (I.O. Records).

47d. In this Auckland may have been influenced by certain paragraphs of the Report of the Committee of Public Instruction for the year 1835 (See Richey, *Selections*, Part II, pp. 71-73), by the petition of Hindus and the memorial from the Asiatic Society.

47e. Auckland to Hobhouse, 20 June, 1836, ADD.Mss., 36473, pp. 70-8. Broughton Correspondence (British Museum).

47f. K.A. Ballahatchet, *The Cambridge Historical Journal*, Vol. X, No. 2, 1951 (Notes and Communications), p. 224-29. In this article Mr. Ballahatchet says that the immediate reaction of the Home Authorities to Bentinck's educational policy was decidedly hostile (p. 224), and, again on p. 225, he says that the Home Government's influence seems to have been relatively of little importance in the formation of the new educational policy. Mill's influence is also shown to be of little importance on the basis of the evidence that he gave before the Select Committee of the House of Commons in 1832. (See Parliamentary Papers (1831-32), IX., paras 401, 402 and 406). Mr. Ballahatchet's viewpoint is based on a draft 'Recent changes in Native Education' which was not sent to India. It is James Mill's Despatch of 1824 followed by subsequent instructions from England which for the first time swung the whole educational policy in favour of Western knowledge against the appreciation of Oriental learning.

48. P.N. Bose, III. 157. Three important Missionary Colleges were founded during this period namely, St. Xavier's College (1835), La Martiniere (1836) and Doveton College (1836).
49. Trevelyan, 81-3.
50. *Report of the Education Commission*, 1882, p. 17.
51. Ibid, 25.
52. Dodwell, 197.
53. Ritchey, *Selections*, 402.
54. Syed Mahmood, p. 92.
55. *Moral and Material Progress and Condition of India*, 1823, p. 333.
56. *Report of the Education Commission*, 1882, p. 254.
57. Raleigh, II. 68.
58. Ibid, 69.

59. Ibid.
60. Ibid.
61. *Report of the Indian Universities Commission,* 1902, p. 8.
62. Raleigh, II. 70.
63. Ibid, 53.
64. Ibid, 70.
65. Ibid, 31.
66. *Report of the Indian Universities Commission,* 1902, p. 8.
67. Raleigh, II. 33.
68. Ibid, 41.
69. Ibid, 33.
70. Lovat-Fraser, 188-9.
71. Ibid, 189.
72. Ibid, 191.
73. Chirol, *India, Old and New,* 141.
74. Lovat-Fraser, 200.
75. Raleigh, II. 67.
76. Ibid, 75.
77. Lovat-Fraser, 196.
78. Ibid, 189-90.
79. Ibid, 190.
80. Ibid, 194.
81. The account that follows is largely based on W. Adam's three Reports on Vernacular Education, 1835, 1836 and 1838, Sir Thomas Munro's Minute of 10th March, 1826, M. Elphinstone's Minutes of 13th December 1823 and 13th December 1825, Fisher's Memoir, February 7, 1827, W.D. Arnold's First Report (6th July 1857) and Second Report (25th June 1858), Captain Candy's Report on Deccan Schools, Report of A.D. Campbell, the Collector of Bellary and Sir C.T. Metcalfe (on Education in the Delhi city and territory). Adam's three reports on education contain valuable statistics and important information on the intellectual condition of the people in Bengal and Bihar. The investigation extended over three years. On the nature of Hindu learning see especially the following works: H.H. Wilson, 'Two lectures on the Religious practices and Opinions of the Hindus', delivered before the University of Oxford, 1840 (especially pp. 36-37). H.H. Wilson in James Mill's *'History of British India'*, Vol. VIII, 1858, p. 409. William Ward, *'A View of the History, Life and Religion of the Hindus'*, London (1817-20), Vol. IV, pp. 499 and 502. Dubois, *'Hindu Manners, Customs and Ceremonies'*, (ed. H.K. Beauchamp), London, 1906, pp. 377-378. For Ram Mohan Roy's letter to Lord Amherst which throws light on Hindu learning, see Sharp, Selections from Educational Records, pp. 99-101.

81a. See pp. 17 ff.

82. The Lande Schools in the Panjāb were schools for the commercial and trading community conducted by 'Padhas' in which primarily methods of bookkeeping and systems of accounts were taught. The pupils were expected to show remarkable quickness in figures.
83. *The Private Journal of the Marquess of Hastings,* II. 346.
84. Gleig, G.R., *The Life of Thomas Munro,* I. 61.
85. Heber I. 391.
86. *Report of the Education Commission of 1882,* p. 182.
87. *Moral and Material Progress and Condition of India during the year 1882-3,* Part I, p. 335.
88. Ibid, p. 333.
89. Gopal, S., *The Viceroyalty of Lord Ripon,* 72.
90. Report, p. 112.
91. Ibid, 174-6.
92. Datta, K.K., *Dawn of Renascent India,* 72-91. Cf. also Chapter XLV, Sec. IX.
93. Monier-Williams, 325-6.
94. *Progress of Education in India,* 1897-8 to 1901-2, pp. 298-302.

94a. The Government started a College at Patna in 1844, but it was abolished in 1847. Another effort to start a College in 1856-7 also proved a failure, in both cases due to the apathy of the people. Cf. *A History of the Patna College,* by J.N. Sarkar and J.C. Jha (1963).

95. Richey, *Selections,* II. 94.
96. Ibid, 91-2.

97. Woodrow's plan was based on the retention of the existing schools which were to be formed into circles (sometimes of 3, 4, or 5), to each of which a teacher of a higher class was appointed. Under this system of circle schools, one superior teacher visited a group of village schools in turn.
98. *Report of the Indian Universities Commission*, 1902, p. 5.
99. The figures are based on Census Reports and Imperial Gazetteers.
100. The Lancasterian method is the monitorial system of instruction followed by Joseph Lancaster (1778-1838) of England in which advanced pupils in a school teach pupils below them.
101. K. Ballahachet, *'Social Policy and Social Change in Western India'* (1817-30), pp. 248-255.
102. For educational activities in Western India, see George Smith, *'The Life of John Wilson'*, London, 1878, especially pp. 47-51, 69, 74.
103. Dadabhai Naoroji was appointed Professor of Elphinstone College and thus fulfilled the hope expressed that 'the happy period would arrive when natives of this country would be found qualified for holding them'.
104. Richey, *Selections*, op. cit. p. 29. This fee was estimated by Mr. J.E.D. Bethune in his Minute of 23 January, 1851.
105. See V.N. Datta, Grounds For Differences between Malcolm and Bentinck, PIHC, 1958, p. 449. See also K. Ballahachet, op.cit. pp. 248-52.
106. Richey, *Selections*, op. cit. p. 19.
107. Richey, *Selections*, Jervis's Minute, 24 February, 1847, p. 11.
108. Ibid, Perry's Minute, 14 April, 1847, pp. 14-16.
109. V.N. Datta, Grounds of Differences between Malcolm and Bentinck, *PIHC*, 1958, pp. 450-52.
110. *Report of the Indian Universities Commission, 1902*, p. 5.
111. Mary Carpenter, *Six Months in India*, London, 1868, Vol. I, pp. 47-81.
112. Parliamentary Papers (Appendix 1), Extract of a letter, Court of Director to the Governor in Council, Fort St. George, 16 April, 1826, p. 510.
113. Richey, *Selections*, p. 181.
114. At first the High School and the University of Madras were synonymous, and later on, when the High School became a Collegiate Institution, it had still the designation of the University of Madras.
115. *Report of the Indian Universities Commission*, 1902, p. 5.
116. Richey, *Selections*, p. 49.
117. Ibid, 228.
118. A number of villages were linked together in a Halka or circle, and a central school under a trained teacher was established within reach of every village, the expense being met by a local cess of 1 per cent. of the land revenue, nominally voluntary. Selection of the village was guided by considerations of geographical situation.
119. Richey, *Selections*, 266-7.
120. Ibid, 267-8.
121. Ibid, 259.
122. Ibid, 265.
123. *Report of the Indian Universities Commission, 1902*, p. 5.
124. Richey, *Selections*, p. 281.
125. *Report of the Indian Universities Commission, 1902*, p. 5.
126. There is an interesting account of the aims and objects of the Chief's Colleges in Curzon's speeches. See Raleigh, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 255-64 (speech delivered at Daly College at Indore), pp. 265-70 (speech delivered at Rajkumar College, Rajkot), and pp. 284-89 (speech delivered at Mayo College, Ajmer).
127. *Report of the Education Commission of 1882*, p. 484.
128. Syed Mahmood, 149.
129. Ibid, 175.
130. For further details of Syed Ahmad, Cf. Chapter XLVI.
131. Syed Mahmood, 168.
132. Ibid, 186.
133. *Progress of Education in India*, 1897-8 to 1901-2, p. 372.
134. *Bentinck* (RI), pp. 150-57.

CHAPTER III (XLI)

IMPACT OF WESTERN CULTURE

The introduction of English education broke the barrier which had hitherto effectively shut India from the Western world. The great Muslim scholar, Al-Bīrūnī, remarked about 1,000 A.D. that the Hindus kept themselves aloof from the outer world and were ignorant of the arts and sciences of the West.[1] This glaring defect of the Hindus was equally evident eight hundred years later. But a great change came over them at the beginning of the nineteenth century A.D: English education opened the flood-gates of the Western ideas which almost overwhelmed them at the beginning. Fifty years of English education brought greater changes in the minds of the educated Hindus of Bengal than the previous thousand years.

The principal reason for this is that India came into contact with Western ideas at a most opportune moment. It was the Age of the French Illumination when the spirit of rationalism and individualism dominated European thought. It proclaimed supremacy of reason over faith, of individual conscience over outside authority, and brought in its train new conceptions of social justice and political rights. A new ideology suddenly burst forth upon the static life, moulded for centuries by a fixed set of religious ideas and social conventions. It gave birth to a critical attitude towards religion and a spirit of inquiry into the origin of State and society with a view to determining their proper scope and functions.

To put it in a concrete form, the most important result of the impact of Western culture on India was the replacement of blind faith in current traditions, beliefs, and conventions—characteristic of the Medieval Age by a spirit of rationalism which seeks to inquire and argue before accepting anything. The revolt of the mind against the tyranny of dogma and traditional authorities, beliefs, and customs, is the first requisite for freedom of thought and conscience which lies at the root of progress in social, religious and political spheres of life. Indeed this is the reason why progress in all these different spheres is inter-dependent to a certain extent. In Bengal the rationalising effect of English education at first manifested itself more in religious and social ideas, but it was not long before it profoundly affected also the political consciousness of the people. The Brāhma Samāj was the outcome of the first, and it has often been claimed that it has contributed largely to the ideals of political freedom.[2] It would perhaps be more correct to say that both are the results of the same rationalistic urge which was created by Western culture. In any case, it is impossible to deny that these movements were linked together to a certain extent, and it is therefore necessary to give some account of the transformation of social and religious ideas before we go into details of the evolution of political ideas.

It was almost inevitable that the first effect of free thinking on the immature minds of the young men who drank deep into the English literature would be more destructive than constructive, particularly in social and religious matters. The challenge of rationality is almost sure to generate, first of all, a deliberate revolt against beliefs and practices which rest solely upon the sanction of ages, unsupported by reason or argument. That was undoubtedly the case with the English-educated youth of Bengal. The evils that followed were much exaggerated at the time, because they gave a rude shock to the orthodox people, and created a vague alarm in their minds about the total wreck of the general framework of Hindu society which they held so dear. We find pointed references to it in eight letters,[3] published in Bengali periodicals between November 6, 1830, and October 22, 1831. One gentleman laments "that his boy, educated in the Hindu College, has given up the old dress and customs. He dresses his hair, wears English type of shoes, does not put a garland round his neck, eats before taking bath, and neglects other rules of ceremonial purity". More serious is the charge made by another, that when he took his son, also a student of the Hindu College, to the temple of goddess Kālī at Kalighat, the boy, instead of prostrating himself before the deity, like others, simply accosted her by saying, "Good morning, madam".[3a] Among other complaints may be mentioned the habit of talking and writing letters in English, signing names with English initials, neglecting useful information or knowledge of India while concentrating on Europe, and holding the views of atheists like Chārvāka.

It is known from other sources also that a section of boys of the Hindu College gave up old religious ideas and social customs and deliberately adopted practices most offensive to Hindu sentiments, such as drinking wine, eating beef etc. There was a general outcry and, according to a Bengali Weekly of April 30, 1831, nearly 200 boys out of 450 or 460 left the college.[4] Derozio's teaching was supposed to be at the root of all evils, and he was dismissed from service. Some correspondents suggested that the authorities of the

Hindu College should issue definite orders to the teachers and students that unless they adhere strictly to the ancestral customs and beliefs they should be expelled from the college.[5] Others suggested that the Government should authorize the Magistrates to punish those who do not observe the orthodox rules and practices.[6]

But the defenders of the Hindu College were also not wanting. They pointed out that many young men used to violate social customs even before the establishment of the Hindu College and were guilty of other moral lapses from which the boys receiving English education were comparatively free. Thus one correspondent refers pointedly to the habits of drinking and keeping Muslim mistresses, freely indulged in by the rich Hindu young men, and their participation in various types of bad associations, long before the establishment of the Hindu college. He referred in particular to the lurid picture of society drawn in a book entitled *Navabābu-vilāsa,* which fortunately is still available.[7] Another writer points out that out of four or five hundred boys reading in Hindu College and Missionary schools, only about thirty or forty have given up religious beliefs or violated social customs.[8]

Even long after 1831 A.D., when the above letters were written, some of the evils complained of continued in full force. Rājnārāyan Basu, the Father of Nationalism in Bengal, throws interesting light on this in his autobiography. Along with his friends he used to take forbidden meat and wine in the park facing the present university buildings and was forced to leave the Hindu College in 1844 on account of illness caused by excessive drinking. He remarks that in those days the students of the Hindu College looked upon drinking as a mark of civilization and found nothing wrong in it. The young men of the preceding generation, said he, did not drink, but were addicted to other evils such as visiting prostitutes, taking intoxicants like *ganja* and *charas,* and indulged in *bulbul*-fight and gambling over kite-flying. Hindu College students were free from these, and would not have taken to drinking wine if they had not regarded it as a badge of civilization.[9] It is interesting to note that Rājnārāyan's father asked his son to join with him in taking food cooked by Muslims and drinking moderately in his presence, in order to cure the habit of excessive drinking.[10]

There is no denying the fact that the English education brought about a great change in social and religious outlook. The extent to which it was healthy and good for national life, or was instrumental in demoralizing or denationalizing the people, is a matter of opinion and a subject of dispute, to which reference will be made in a subsequent chapter. For the present it is necessary to examine the positive contributions of this education to the national welfare, which are often lost sight of.

As noted above, the first and foremost positive effect is that it instilled into the minds of Indians a spirit of rational inquiry into the basis of their religion and society. This spirit is typified by the personality of Raja Rammohan Roy and led to the foundation of Brāhma Samāj. The Raja challenged the current religious beliefs and social practices of the Hindus as not being in consonance with their own scriptures.[11] He tried to show that the belief in a multiplicity of divinities and worship of images, which formed the essence of the current and popular Hindu religion, was opposed to the teaching of the Vedas. How far his views are historically correct, or morally sound, is a matter of secondary importance. What really matters is his open and public protest against the blind acceptance of whatever passed current on the authority of priesthood or its interpretation of scriptures. The standard of revolt he thus raised against the medieval tyranny of dogmas unleashed forces which created what may be called Modern India and makes him worthy to rank by the side of Bacon and Luther. "The first assumption of Raja Rammohan Roy is that there is a universal reason at work in nature and in society, and that religions in their pure and pristine form are the expression of that reason in man. The task of reason today is to disentangle the elements of permanent and universal truth in each faith from the mass of accretions which has gathered round them and to return to them as the basis of our religious life".[12]

How much the Hindu society needed this element of reason to overcome the tyranny of gross superstition is illustrated by the practice of *sati* or burning of widows along with the dead bodies of their husbands. This inhuman practice, though widely prevalent, hardly shocked the sensibilities of any, and when Rammohan and others protested against this cruel custom, quite a large number of educated and respectable Hindus came forward to defend it till the very last.

Rammohan assailed the strongest part of the citadel of Hindu religion and society. He opposed the worship of images of gods and goddesses, denounced *sati*, polygamy, and abuses of the caste system, favoured re-marriage of Hindu widows, and set at naught the prohibition of crossing the sea by his voyage to England. By these successive shocks he galvanised the dormant Hindu society and set in motion that liberalism in thought and action which has enabled it to shake off the fetters of ages.

But "the Raja's movement could hardly be called a movement of religious and social *revolt*. While claiming the right of private judgment in the interpretation of ancient scriptures, the Raja never repudiated their authority; nor did he, while seeking to assert the right of individual conscience to determine for itself what was right or wrong, ever repudiate the authority of that social conscience which spoke through ancient social laws and sanctified social traditions. He tried really to reconcile individual reason with ancient scriptures and individual conscience with social authority."[13]

Devendra-nath Tagore, who succeeded Rammohan as the head of the Brāhma Samāj, "proclaimed the supremacy of human reason, which was in its original intuitions really the Eternal Light of God reflected through the mind of man, over all scriptures and hallowed injunctions." Keshab-chandra Sen, who followed him, "carried this protest still further and proclaimed the absolute supremacy of the individual conscience over every form of outside authority in the determination of human conduct, either of scriptures or traditions or customs, however immemorial or sanctified these may be. Debendra Nath gave us a new faith that sought to make us free in spirit; Keshub Chunder gave us a new moral test that made us free from all social bondage. Raja Rammohan Roy proclaimed the Unity of the Godhead to a people who believed, against the teachings of their highest scriptures, in a multiplicity of gods. Debendra Nath proclaimed the freedom of our reason from the bondage of ancient scriptural authority. Keshub Chunder proclaimed the absolute freedom of the individual conscience from the bondage of caste and customs. The Raja's was not, strictly speaking, a movement of active revolt; Debendra Nath's was really a movement of religious revolt; Keshub Chunder's, representing the third stage in the evolution of the Brahma Samaj, was a movement of social revolt. In this way, step by step, the freedom movement in modern India grew and developed, becoming larger and larger under the inspiration of the Brahma Samaj."[14]

Although the Brāhma Samāj was the visible embodiment of the new spirit, it never became a powerful movement. It began to dwindle in importance in less than half a century after its foundation, and the number of its members is not at present more than five thousand. Its history will be dealt with in the next chapter.

The impact of Western culture on Hinduism has been described as follows by one of its greatest philosophers:

"The spread of western education and ideals stimulated movements within Hinduism designed to preserve its essential principles and at the same time to remove excrescences which were opposed not only to the spirit of Hinduism but also to the ideals spread by western culture. What is the spirit of Hinduism? What are its essential principles? The spirit of science is not dogmatic certainty but the disinterested pursuit of truth, and Hinduism is infused by the same spirit. Fixed intellectual beliefs mark off one religion from another, but Hinduism sets itself no such limits. It is comprehensive and synthetic, seeking unity not in a common creed but in a common quest for truth. Hinduism is more a way of life than a form of thought. It insists not on religious conformity but on a spiritual and ethical outlook in life. It is fellowship of all who accept the law of right and earnestly seek for the truth."[15]

This is quite true. The Brāhma Samāj has perhaps lost a great deal of its force and vitality by formulating a religious creed, with fixed intellectual beliefs, outside the pale of Hinduism, though its social separation as a community was perhaps less a choice than a necessity.[16] But be that as it may, the Brāhma Samāj has effectively helped the progress of Hindu society; first, by stemming the tide of conversion to Christianity; secondly, by holding a living example of society based on progressive and liberal views; and thirdly, by supplying eminent persons who advanced liberal ideas in other spheres of life such as politics. This last point requires some elaboration.

It is not a mere accident that Raja Rammohan Roy who introduced rationalistic principles in social and religious ideas, was also the pioneer of political reforms in modern India. Human mind is a composite whole, and it is quite natural that if it is actuated by liberal and rational ideas in one sphere of life, it would follow the same tendency in other spheres as well. The spirit which revolts at the tyranny of priesthood is more likely to raise its voice of protest also against the oppression of the State;—the mind which does not accept the religious and social abuses, simply because they are current and followed without question, is less likely to accept, without demur, the evils of subjection to an alien power on the ground of long-standing tradition of loyalty, rendered possible by lack of political consciousness. Further, even those who were not bold or strong enough to follow in actual life rational principles in social and religious spheres for fear of the extreme violence of the inevitable reaction, were inspired by these environments to hold advanced ideas in political life,—which were less likely, *at that time*, to involve him in immediate troubles. In any case there is hardly any doubt that the liberal movements for religious and social reform are closely connected with the movement for political emancipation. "It is impossible to understand Indian political aspirations and activities if one divorces them from that nation's great new spiritual urge towards Truth and Justice—aye, and Love—of which the one and the other alike are but outward manifestations".[17] The truth of this remark, apparent at almost every stage of national evolution in India, comes to the fore by the study of such notable personalities as Raja Rammohan Roy, Dayanand Saraswati, Swami Vivekananda, and Mahatma Gandhi. The Renascence of India like her great Banyan tree, threw numerous shoots, which might appear as separate, but had all a common root.

Life in India, more than in any other country, is dominated by religious and spiritual forces. To minimise the influence of these forces in political and national evolution is to lose the correct perspective. The impact of rational ideas on our religion no doubt produced some evil consequences at the beginning. But they were transitory in character like a high tidal wave and soon passed away, leaving rich deposits of fertilising soil. A great philosopher of India has drawn a very lucid and correct picture in the following lines: "With the growth of the British power the old order weakened and the confidence of Indians in their own culture diminished. Many were dazzled by the civilization of the West, which seemed to be better adapted for the acquisition of temporal power. A few were so enchanted by it that they took to western culture with the enthusiasm of neophytes and endeavoured to westernize themselves completely; some became Christians. Proclaiming the futility and worthlessness of India's social and religious institutions, they wished to rebuild the structure of national life on new foundations. Not so the great majority. In the Mughal period those who wished to take service under the Mughals acquired a knowledge of Persian, but such an acquisition did not make them less Indian or more attached to the religion of their rulers. So now the classes educated in English did not, as a rule, give up their traditional ways of life and habits of mind, but used western learning for improving their own culture and adapting it to the new impulses created by contact with the west".[18]

So far we have indicated, in a general way, the nature of the impact of the West on India and the consequent changes it wrought upon the social, religious, and political ideas. If we analyze the progress of Indian people during the nineteenth century, it will appear that there was hardly any aspect of life and society which was not deeply affected by the impact. Side by side with the rise of new religious sects, we find a profound change in the orthodox Hindu religion. There was a persistent demand for the removal of social abuses and the introduction of social reforms on modern lines. The ideals and method of education underwent a revolutionary change. Equally revolutionary was the change brought into the domain of literature, and modern Indian literatures in spoken languages in different localities had their birth. The periodical literature was an innovation with far-reaching consequences. The printing press made an epoch-making change in the spread of education among the people. All these factors combined to generate among the Indians a strong sense of patriotism and nationalism which had hitherto been lacking. All these, which will be discussed in detail in the subsequent chapters, transformed India from the Medieval to the Modern Age. The nineteenth century was the great dividing line, and these hundred years changed the face of India far more than did the preceding thousand years. This gives a measure of the effect of Western impact on India.

---

1. See above, Vol. V, p. 127.
2. B.C. Pal—II, 14 ff., 66.
3. B.N. Banerji, II. 165-76.
3a. Ibid, 171.
4. Ibid, II. 13, 27; III. 199.
5. Ibid, II. 172.
6. Ibid, II. 171.
7. Ibid, II. 167-8.
8. Ibid, II. 169.
9. *Ātmacharit* (autobiography) of Rājnārāyan Basu, p. 45.
10. Ibid, 47.
11. The Raja was influenced both by Western ideas and Muslim theology. But that his teachings were widely accepted was undoubtedly due to Western influence alone.
12. Buch—I, 65.
13. B.C. Pal—II, 17.
14. Ibid, 25-6.
15. O'Malley—I, 339.
16. Cf. the opinion of M.G. Ranade on this subject quoted in Chapter VII.
17. Zacharias, 15.
18. O'Malley—I, 338-9.

CHAPTER IV (XLII)

NEW RELIGIOUS IDEAS

I. THE BRĀHMA SAMĀJ.

1. *Rāmmohan Roy*

Reference has been made above to the rationalistic ideas of Rājā Rāmmohan Roy which ultimately led to the establishment of Brāhma Samāj as a separate religious and social community. Rāmmohan Roy never regarded himself as the founder of a separate sect or society, but lived and died as a reformed Hindu, wearing its most prominent symbol, the sacred cord (*yajñopavīta*), till the last day of his life.

Of the early life of Rāmmohan Roy we know very little that is certain. He was born, probably, in 1774[1] in an orthodox and wealthy Brahman family, at the village of Rādhānagar, Burdwan District, in West Bengal. He studied Persian and Arabic at Patna and this had enormous influence on his subsequent life. The Muslim culture and philosophy, particularly the Sūfī ideas, got a strong hold upon him. His habits and tastes were those of a Muhammadan. He wore Muhammadan dress and took Muslim dishes even at home. Probably, as a result of the study of the original Q'urān in Arabic, he became convinced of the errors of worshipping images of gods. It is said that so deep was this conviction in his mind, that shortly after his return from Patna, while he was about sixteen or seventeen, he wrote a treatise calling in question the validity of the idolatrous system of the Hindus in which he had been brought up. His father, after a hot discussion with him on this subject, drove him out of his house. Rāmmohan then led a wandering life for three or four years, in course of which he is believed to have visited Tibet. After his return he settled down at Vārānasi (Banaras) and studied Sanskrit language and sacred literature of the Hindus.[2] On the death of his father in 1803, Rāmmohan moved to Murshidābād and wrote a Persian treatise entitled *Tuhfat-ul-Muwahhidin*, or "*A Gift to Monotheists*", "a work protesting against the idolatries and superstitions of all creeds and trying to lay a common foundation of Universal Religion in the doctrine of the Unity of the Godhead".[3]

From 1805 to 1814 Rāmmohan was in close touch with Mr. John Digby, a covenanted servant of the East India Company. Twice during this period Rāmmohan was employed in the Company's service for short terms under Mr. Digby. The second time he was officiating Dewan under Digby, who was then the Collector of Rangpur. After serving in this capacity from December 1809 to March 1811, he had to leave the service as he was not made permanent in spite of the strong recommendations of Mr. Digby. But Rāmmohan continued to stay in Rangpur, being privately employed by Mr. Digby.[4]

"The period of his residence at Rangpur (1809-1814) was a fruitful one. On the one hand, during his residence there, he improved his own mind by acquiring varied knowledge, and, on the other, by holding discussion-meetings with representative men of various sects, such as Hindus, Mahomedans and Jainas, he tried to disseminate his principles among all classes of people. In addition to a knowledge of the old Vedāntic literature of the country, he is said to have made a careful study of modern Tāntric works with the aid of Hariharānanda Tīrthaswāmi, a Bengali Tāntric mendicant whose acquaintance he made there, and also to have mastered the contents of the *Kalpa Sūtra* and other works of the Jaina religion. Something like an informal club used to meet every evening at his residence, which attracted all classes of people and gave rise to earnest discussions on various religious topics.

"In the midst of his arduous duties and his frequent discussion-meetings, Rammohan Roy found time to improve his knowledge of English by private study commenced in his twenty-second year. It is also stated by Mr. Digby that, with the progress of his knowledge of the English language, Rammohan Roy began to take, while at Rangpur, a keen interest in European politics, specially in the course of the French Revolution."[5]

In 1814 Rāmmohan retired from service and after some time settled down in Calcutta.[6] Here he came into contact with a number of persons whose minds were influenced by the Western education and who therefore fully sympathized with his rationalistic views and principles. With their co-operation Rāmmohan founded, in 1815, the Ātmīya Sabhā, which held weekly meetings for propagating the monotheistic doctrines of the Hindu scriptures. In a famous debate on idol-worship in 1819 Rāmmohan vanquished Subrahmanya Śāstrī, an erudite Brahmin of Madras. In 1825 he established the Vedānta College for teaching the monotheistic doctrines of the Vedānta "as a means for leading his countrymen into pure and elevated theism".

Rāmmohan also turned his attention to the publication of tracts. "During the course of his researches into the domain of Sanskrit literature, Rammohan Roy was struck by the purity of the monotheistic doctrines of the Upanishads, and at once decided to publish some of them with his preface and translations. This he considered to be most effective means of rousing his countrymen to a sense of the superiority of the monotheistic creed. Nor were his expectations disappoined. Their publication soon produced an intense and wide-spread agitation in Indian society, the like of which had seldom been witnessed in Bengal."[7]

Rāmmohan says in his autobiographical sketch:[8]

"After my father's death I opposed the advocates of idolatry with still greater boldness. Availing myself of the art of printing, now established in India, I published various works and pamphlets against their errors, in the native and foreign languages. This raised such a feeling against me, that I was at last deserted by every person except two or three Scotch friends, to whom, and the nation to which they belong, I always feel grateful." Deserted by his friends and relatives Rāmmohan carried the fight single-handed. In 1820 he published the book entitled *The Precepts of Jesus, the Guide to Peace and Happiness,* embodying the moral and spiritual precepts of Jesus without the narratives of the miracles. It called forth hostile criticism from the Baptist missionaries of Serampore and "gave rise to a controversy which finally turned upon the doctrine of Trinity, and Rammohun Roy successively published three *Appeals to the Christian public,* the last appearing in 1823, in which, by a rare display of polemical skill, as well as of profound Biblical learning, he tried to uphold his favourite doctrine of the unity of the Godhead. It is evident that during the course of his researches into the Christian scriptures he had not confined himself to the English rendering of the Bible alone, but had acquired Hebrew and Greek in order to be able to refer to the originals".[9] It is unnecessary to dwell at length upon the keen and protracted controversy between Rāmmohan and the orthodox Christians. The conversion of a Baptist missionary, Mr. William Adam, to the Unitarian principles of Rāmmohan embittered the controversy and led to the foundation of a Unitarian Mission in Calcutta by their joint endeavour.

Far more important was the foundation of the Brāhma Samāj.

"There are two accounts current about the establishment of the Brahmo Samaj. One is, that seeing the failure of his Unitarian Mission Mr. Adam himself suggested it as a substitute; the other is that one day while Rammohun Roy was returning home in his carriage from the service of Mr. Adam, his young disciples Tarachand Chakravarti and Chandra Sekhar Dev, who were with him, complained of the necessity of attending a Unitarian place of worship, in the absence of one entirely suited to their views and principles. Rammohun Roy took this complaint to heart, and forthwith proceeded to call a meeting of his friends, at which it was decided to open a place for the unsectarian worship of the One True God. Many of his rich friends came forward to meet the expenses, and a house was rented to accommodate the first theistic congregation. Here on the 6th of *Bhādra,* Śakābda Era 1750, corresponding to the 20th of August, 1828, the first Samaj was opened with Tarachand Chakravarti as its Secretary. Meetings of the Samaj were held every Saturday evening and the following order of service was observed:—Two Telugu Brahmins used to recite the Vedas in a sideroom, screened from the view of the congregation, where non-Brahmins would not be admitted."[10] The Sanskrit texts of the Upanishads were read and translated into Bengali, and sermons were preached or read. This Samāj was also known as the Brahma Sabhā or the "One God Society".[10a] The wrath of the orthodox community knew no bounds and their hostility was further increased by the abolition of the *Satī* rite in 1829 as Rāmmohan was closely associated with the agitation against this cruel rite.

The Brāhma Samāj began to attract gradually increasing numbers from the educated middle class, though there were perhaps more sympathisers than formal members. But Rāmmohan and others raised sufficient funds for purchasing a house for the Brāhma Samāj before the end of the year 1829. All this provoked the orthodox Hindu community to organize a rival association called Dharma Sabhā. Its secretary and guiding spirit was Rādhākānta Dev, the recognized leader of the orthodox Hindu community in Calcutta. The two associations had two daily papers as their organs—the *Sambāda-kaumudī* and the *Samāchāra-chandrikā*—which poured forth abuses on each other, and the whole of Calcutta was strongly agitated over the rise of the reformist party under Rāmmohan Roy. People of all classes, castes, and shades of opinion took part in the great controversy, and the number was certainly against Rāmmohan, who had more than a fair share of abuses and ridicule, and even threats of personal violence. The agitation gradually spread into the interior and the entire Hindu society was convulsed in a manner to which there was no parallel within living memory.

In the midst of this country-wide agitation Rāmmohan opened his Church on the 11th *Māgh,* the 23rd of January, 1830, before a gathering of 500, and placed it in the hands of a few trustees. In a manifesto, which formed part of the trust-deed, it was clearly laid down that the building could be used by anyone for "the worship and adoration of the one Eternal Unsearchable and Immutable Being, who is the Author and Preserver of the Universe, but not under or by any other name, designation or title", and no image or picture should be admitted. The new church was, therefore, not intended by the Raja as special property of any particular sect but "a meeting ground of all sects for the worship of One True God",[11] his one and ultimate object being to 'revive monotheism in India on the basis of the Vedānta'. As Śiva-nāth Śāstrī says, "the mission of Rāmmohan Roy was simple, namely to call his countrymen to discard idolatry and come to the worship of the One True God. His work was mainly negative and reformatory and not positive or constructive".[12]

2. *Devendra-nāth Tagore*

The newly formed Brāhma Samāj, latterly known as the "Calcutta Brahmo Samaj", was reduced to a moribund condition after the death of Rāmmohan Roy in 1833. It was somehow kept up by the joint efforts of Dwārakā-nāth Tagore who supplied the necessary fund, which was very small, and Pandit Rām-chandra Vidyābāgīsh who conducted the weekly service and ministered to the spiritual needs of those few who cared to attend it.

New life was infused into the church by the eldest son of Dwārakā-nāth Tagore, named Devendra-nāth Tagore, who had come into contact with Rāmmohan. He was converted to the new faith in 1838, and next year established a Society, known later as Tattvabodhinī Sabhā, which attracted a large number of rich and influential men. He was soon struck by the miserable condition of Brāhma Samāj. The doctrine of Rāma's incarnation was being preached from the pulpit. "Most of those who attended the services were idolators at home. There was no organisation, no constitution, no membership, no covenant, no pledge."[13] Devendra-nāth framed a covenant for the church on the lines laid down by Rāmmohan and each devotee, who accepted it, had to declare that he would conform to the rules of the religious life laid down by the Vedānta and worship God daily by the *Gāyatrī-mantra.* In 1843, Devendra-nāth, with twenty associates, took formal initiation at the hands of Rāmchandra Vidyābāgīsh and signed the covenant. This was a memorable event, being the first step so far taken towards converting the Brāhma Samāj into a distinct spiritual fraternity. It is to be noted, however, that the mode of initiation adopted by Devendra-nāth was strictly in accordance with the injunctions of the *Mahānirvāṇa Tantra.*

The church now entered upon a career of useful activity, and the Tattvabodhinī Sabhā served as its missionary organization. Many of the works of Rāmmohan Roy were republished and a monthly journal, called the *Tattvabodhinī Patrikā,* was started under the editorsrip of Akshay-kumār Datta. A number of preachers were employed for propaganda in mofussil, and many *Samājas* sprang up in provincial towns. A school was also established for the religious instruction of young men.

In course of a controversy with the Christians (in 1845) the Vedas were publicly proclaimed as the basis of the religion of the Brāhma Samāj, which was held up as Vedāntism. Prominence was also given to the doctrine of 'infallibility of the Vedas.' This was not liked by a strong section, headed by Akshay-kumār Datta whose "rationalistic nature found it difficult to reconcile itself to that doctrine."[14] In order to reconcile the differences, four Brāhmaṇa youths were sent to Banaras in 1845 to study the Vedas and in 1847 Devendra-nāth himself went there to form a correct idea of the teachings of the Vedas. As a result of these studies and investigations the doctrine of the infallibility of the Vedas was given up, but Devendra-nāth decided to keep the movement as much as possible on the old lines of reverence for the ancient Hindu scriptures. Accordingly he made a compilation of passages from Upanishads, inculcating the truth of Monotheism. He also laid down certain fundamental principles of Natural Theism and framed a new covenant consistent with the principles of Natural and Universal Theism, in the place of the old Vedāntic covenant. All these took place between 1847 and 1850.

3. *Keshab-chandra Sen*

The period between 1850 and 1856 witnessed a tendency amongst the younger members "not only to broaden the basis of Brāhmaism by advocating new social ideals but also to apply the dry light of reason even to the fundamental articles of religious belief. They advocated female education, supported widow-remarriage, cried down intemperance,denounced polygamy, tried to rationalise Brāhma doctrines and sought to conduct the affairs of the church on strictly constitutional principles."[14a]

To this class belonged Keshab-chandra Sen who joined the Samāj in 1857, became a wholetime missionary of the Samāj in 1861, and was elevated to the position of the Āchārya or the Chief Minister in 1862. He formed the Sangat Sabhā and infused new life into the Samāj. An active spirit of social reform was shown by celebrating inter-caste marriages and various other unorthodox practices. It was mainly due to the personality of Keshab-chandra that the Brāhma Samāj gained in strength and number. There were only six Brāhmas in 1829, 100 in 1839, 500 in 1849 and 2,000 in 1864.[15] But the advanced ideas of active social reforms, such as the inter-caste marriage, widow-remarriage, removal of *purdah* for women, etc. were not liked by the older section. All this led to an open conflict between the older and younger sections which was brought to a head by the protest of the younger section against the custom of allowing Brāhmaṇas with sacred thread to occupy the pulpit.[16] Although Devendra-nāth at first agreed to their demand, he was ultimately induced by the older party 'not to be drawn away from the old Hindu lines laid down by Rājā Rāmmohan Roy'. This created a definite split between the two sections. Keshab-chandra Sen had already organized a Brāhma Pratinidhi Sabhā (Representative Assembly). He and his followers now seceded from the old party led by Devendra-nāth and formed a new organization, called "The Brāhma Samāj of India", towards the end of 1866. Shortly after this schism Devendra-nāth retired from active participation in the work of the Ādi Brāhma Samāj (as the older organization was called), and Rājnārāyan Bose became its President.

In reply to the assertion of the Ādi Brāhma Samāj of Devendra-nāth that Brāhmaism is Hinduism, the young reformers under Keshab maintained that "Brahmoism is catholic and universal", and declared that the renunciation of caste was as essential to Brāhmaism as the renunciation of idolatry. These were the two main issues upon which the two sections parted, to the ultimate detriment of both.

Keshab brought to the Brāhma Samāj a dynamic force which it never possessed before. He had a striking personality, showed ceaseless activity, was marked by a high degree of piety and sincerity and, above all, possessed wonderful oratorical abilities. He made Brāhmaism a real force all over Bengal and was the first to inaugurate an all-India movement of religious and social reforms. He made a missionary tour to Bombay (1864), Madras (1864) and North-Western Provinces (1868). He and his followers carried the message of Brāhma Samāj all over India, and Brāhma congregations were established in many intellectual centres in India, sometimes under different names as Prārthanā Samāj in Bombay, and Veda Samāj (later called Brāhma Samāj) in Madras. It is interesting to note that this was the first all-India movement, which was a precursor of a similar movement undertaken a few years later by another Bengali, Surendra-nāth Banerji. But while Surendra-nāth worked for political reforms, Keshab's object was limited to religious reforms based on personal liberty and social equality and emancipation. As noted above, this might have indirectly influenced the ideas of political liberty. But Keshab deliberately eschewed politics; he and his followers "openly proclaimed loyalty to the British Government as an article of the creed of his Church".[17] This no doubt endeared him to the British Government which was ready to encourage freedom of thought, ideas of social reforms on modern lines, and even social revolt, so long as these did not touch upon the dangerous ground of politics. So Keshab was lionised both in India and England and was openly hailed as a deliverer of his people by Lord Lawrence, the Viceroy.[18] Keshab's annual addresses at the Town Hall were attended by the highest officials.[19] At his request the Government of India passed a special legislation for legalising Brāhma marriages which were not valid in the eyes of Hindu law as the idol of Śālagrām was not present during the ceremony and caste-rules were not followed in selecting brides for bridegrooms.

The new legislation, called the Native Marriage Act, popularly known as the Civil Marriage Act, was passed in 1872. It was applicable to anyone who declared: "I am not a Hindu, not a Mussalman, not a Christian". The Bill was originally called 'Brahmo Marriage Bill', but the Ādi Brāhma Samāj lodged a protest on the ground that they still regarded themselves as Hindus. Though the Act authorized unorthodox marriages, not sanctioned by Hindu scriptures and performed in violation of the restrictions imposed by them, it imposed certain new restraints upon those who sought to take advantage of it. Monogamy was made obligatory and the minimum age for the bridegroom and bride was fixed, respectively, at 18 and 14. The Act facilitated the sweeping social reforms, particularly the abolition of caste distinctions, advocated by Keshab, and was justly regarded as a great personal triumph by his followers. But the passing of the Act was strongly resented by the Hindus and gave an impetus to the Hindu Revivalist Movement to which reference will be made later.

Under the inspiration and leadership of Keshab-chandra Sen the Brāhma Samāj launched a comprehensive programme of social reforms which formed a vital aspect of Indian Renaissance. Some idea of these may be formed from the "Indian Reform Association" which was founded by Keshab on his return from England in 1870. The programme of the Association was carried through five sections, each with a Secretary of its own. These sections were:

1. Female improvement; 2. Education of the Working Classes. 3. Cheap Literature. 4. Temperance. 5. Charity.

The item of cheap literature included the publication of the *Sulabh Samāchār*, a weekly paper priced at one pice each issue. It was a new venture and soon became very popular.

The education of women was put in the forefront of the programme of social reforms from beginning to end. In 1863 Keshab started an organization for educating female members at home. Another association was started in the same year for publishing books and journals and holding essay competition for the same purpose. Several other associations were established by Keshab or other members of the Brāhman Samāj for the uplift of women.

While the orthodox Hindu society did not look favourably upon the Brāhma Samāj for discarding image worship, it imbibed, slowly but steadily, the spirit of social reform inaugurated by it, and almost all its items were gradually adopted by the Hindus. Regarding education of women and the raising of their marriageable age the progress achieved by the Hindus far exceeded the wildest dreams of the social reformers of the Brāhma Samāj. The remarriage of widows was accepted by the Hindu society as valid, though it was not much in vogue during the period under review. Polygamy also steadily declined.[19a]

Keshab-chandra Sen raised the Brāhma Samāj to the height of its power by his personal magnetism and radical views. But it is a well-known fact in history that revolution, whether political or religious, gathers momentum as it proceeds, and what was radicalism at one stage becomes moderation itself at the next. So, in course of a few years, younger men with still more radical views challenged the authority of Keshab and deserted him as he had himself deserted Devendra-nāth. The crisis was precipitated by the marriage of the eldest daughter of Keshab with the minor ruler of Cooch Behar. Neither the bridegroom nor the bride had attained the minimum marriageable age as laid down by the Brāhma Samāj and incorporated in the Native Marriage Act of 1872. Further, the marriage ceremony was performed by the Brāhmaṇa priests according to the Hindu rites in the presence of the images of Hindu deities, and the Brāhma form of prayer was not followed. There was a great outcry at this open violation of the fundamental principles of Brāhmaism by the leader himsellf. After a painful controversy and ignoble squabbles, there was a second split or secession, and a younger section led by Śiva-nāth Śāstrī, Ānanda-mohan Bose and others founded the 'Sādhāran Brāhma Samāj' on 15 May, 1878. The remnants of all the three bodies—Ādi (original) Brāhma Samāj, the Brāhma Samāj of India, and the Sādhāran (common) Brāhma Samāj—still exist, but the first two are in a moribund condition. Even the third is in a decadent state and the Brāhma Samāj movement is now a spent force. The total number of its members is probably less than five thousand. As a writer, himself once a Brāhma Missionary, has remarked: "It has become a kind of backwater of religious and communal life, separated by its own sense of self-satisfied superiority from the main currents of national life, which flows past it with a power and rapidity, which it can neither appreciate nor even understand".[20]

Although the observation is substantially correct, it does not contain the whole truth. It ignores the rich legacy which the Brāhma Samāj has bequeathed to the Hindus. Not only the rationalistic spirit and freedom of individual conscience on which the Brāhma Samāj was founded, but most of its social ideas and a great deal of its moral and religious precepts have been imbibed by the Hindus.

Brāhmaism must ever remain an important episode in the history of India. Apart from specially emphasizing the social and personal freedom which was bound to evoke the sense and value of political freedom, Keshab-chandra Sen indirectly contributed to the growth of nationalism in several other ways. The great respect which he commanded among all sections in India, including Europeans and Christian missionaries, and the honours heaped upon him during his visit to England, increased the self-confidence of the Indians and helped the growth of Indian nationalism as will be stated more fully in Chapter XIII. A larger number of individual members of the Brāhma Samāj also made valuable contributions to India's struggle for political freedom.

II. THE PRĀRTHANA SAMĀJ

As mentioned above, the tour of Keshab-chandra Sen led to the foundation of the Prārthanā Samāj (Prayer Society) in Bombay. Keshab first visited Bombay in 1864 and the Prārthanā Samāj was inaugurated in 1867, its leader being Dr. Ātmārām Pandurang (1823-1898). In 1868 Keshab visited Bombay again and strengthened the organization. Two years later, R. G. Bhandarkar and M. G. Ranade joined the Samāj and infused new strength in it.

The two main planks of the Samāj were theistic worship and social reform. It did not produce any new philosophy and literature, nor had much missionary activity. As Ranade wrote, the Samāj seemed to have been "perfectly satisfied with a creed which consists of only one positive belief in the unity of God, accompanied with a special protest against the existing corruption of Hindu religion, viz. the article which denounces the prevalent idolatry to be a sin, and an abomination".[21] Ranade himself tried to give the Samāj a more comprehensive meaning and philosophic basis, and his essay entitled "Theist's Confession of Faith"[22] was an attempt in that direction.

The greatest service of the Samāj, or rather of its individual members, was the organization of social reform movement. The Samāj laid special stress on the abandonment of caste, introduction of widow remarriage, encouragement of female education, and the abolition of *purdah* and child marriage. The principles of social reform enunciated by Ranade himself will be discussed in chapter VII (XLV).

Broadly speaking, the Prārthanā Samāj subscribes to the beliefs of the Sādhāran Brāhma Samāj. Although their theism is derived from Hinduism they do not regard the Veda as divine or infallible, nor believe in the doctrine of transmigration and incarnation of God. Nevertheless, the Prārthanā Samāj had some characteristics which distinguished it from the Brāhma Samāj. As Miss. S. D. Collet wrote in her *Brāhma Year Book* in 1880, the Prārthanā Samāj "never detached itself so far from the Hindu element of Brāhmaism as many of the Bengali Samājes, and both in religious observances and social customs, it clings far more closely to the old models".[23] Another writer put it more bluntly: "The Prārthanā Samāj may be said to be composed of men paying allegiance to Hinduism and to Hindu society with a protest. The members observe the ceremonies of Hinduism, but only as mere ceremonies of routine, destitute of all religious significance. This much sacrifice they make to existing prejudices. Their principle, however, is not to deceive anyone as to their religious opinions, even should an honest expression of views entail unpopularity".[24] As a matter of fact, a rigid exclusion of idolatry and a definite break from the caste system were not regarded as essential conditions of membership as was the case with the Brāhma Samāj of Bengal after its secession from the Ādi Brāhma Samāj of Devendranāth Tagore. The Prārthanā Samāj draws its nourishment very largely from the Hindu scriptures, and uses the hymns of the old Marāṭhā poet-saints in its service.

The Prārthanā Samāj has not spread widely. Several societies originally associated with it changed their name to Brāhma Samāj. On the other hand, the moderate views of the Prārthanā Samāj made it popular in the Telugu country and eighteen out of the twenty-nine Brāhma Samājas in the Madras Presidency bear the name Prārthanā Samāj.[25]

III. THE ĀRYA SAMĀJ[26]

1. *Dayānanda Sarasvatī*

The Brāhma Samāj inspired similar or parallel movements in other parts of India. The most important of these was the Ārya Samāj founded by Svāmī Dayānanda Sarasvatī in 1875.

Dayānanda, known in early life as Mūla Śaṅkara, was born in 1824, in an orthodox Brāhman family living in the small town of Taṅkārā in the old Morvi State in Gujarāt. At the age of fourteen his father took him to a temple on the Sivarātri night in order to observe the custom of worshipping and keeping vigil the whole night. Both Dayānanda's father and the priest of the temple fell asleep after midnight, but the young boy kept himself awake. Suddenly he found that a mouse crept on the image of the deity and took the offerings placed before it. This scene set the boy furiously to thinking. If the deity, thought he, could not protect himself from the impertinence of a mouse, he could not be Śiva, the almighty God, and the image was evidently a helpless inanimate object. He awoke his father who argued with his son, but to no purpose. Dayānanda went home, broke the fast, and fell asleep before the night was over, much to the chagrin of his father and other relatives.

This episode was a turning-point in the career of the boy. He lost his faith in traditional religion and began to think for himself. Five years later died an uncle of Dayānanda who loved him very much. In the spirit of the Buddha, Dayānanda asked his friends and many learned men how death could be overcome. He was told in reply that the practice of *yoga* was the only means to salvation. Dayānanda now looked upon the world and its attractions as merely transient and of no value in comparison with the bliss of salvation. When, therefore, the parents of Dayānanda made arrangements for his marriage, he stealthily left home and adopted the life of an ascetic (*sādhu*), in order to solve the mystery of life and death and attain salvation. He was at first a *brahmachārī* (novitiate) but was formally initiated into ascetic life within a few years. For fifteen years, from 1845 to 1860, he wandered all over India. He practised *yoga* all the while; for days he ate nothing but wild fruits and for months he lived on milk only. He received his education at the feet of Swāmī Birajānanda. When he completed it and took leave of his *guru*, the latter asked him, in lieu of the payment of the usual fee, to take a pledge to devote his life to the dissemination of truth, the waging of incessant warfare against the falsehoods of the prevailing Purānic faith or orthodox Hinduism, and establishing the right method of education as was in vogue in pre-Buddhist time. He willingly gave the pledge, and it has been justly remarked that "never was any human pledge kept more loyally and faithfully".

For two years after this Dayānanda preached his views at numerous public meetings. They gradually excited some interest on account of their heterodox character, and Dayānanda was challenged to defend his point of view in a public meeting at Kāsi (Banaras). It was presided over by the Mahārājā of Banaras, and Dayānanda with a few associates were pitted against three hundred leading Hindu scholars of that great centre of orthodox Hinduism. As could be expected, and much to the disappointment of thousands who had assembled at the meeting, the result of the disputation was inconclusive, each side claiming victory. But this public discussion made Dayānanda a renowned public figure and a recognized preacher of new religious views. From this date may be counted the effective beginning of Dayānanda's mission. Among other places he visited Calcutta and there was some talk of his rapprochement with the Brāhma Samāj.

Although there are many points of agreement between the Brāhma Samāj and the Ārya Samāj, there are also differences. The latter insists upon veneration of cow and the offer of a daily sacrifice of butter in the hearth-fire. It condemns not only polytheism but also monotheism as preached by Christianity and Islam. The Brāhma Samāj was based on rationalistic movement of the West; its appeal was to the English-educated classes, and its object was to form an elite. Dayānanda did not know English and he appealed to the emotion of the masses.[27]

It has been held by some that Dayānanda "at first tried to come to terms with Brāhma Samāj, and there was a conference in Calcutta in 1869, but it came to nothing"; he also tried to capture the Prārthanā Samāj of Ahmadabad, but failed. But the Ārya Samājists put the whole thing in a different way. According to Lālā Lājpat Rāi the leaders of Brāhma Samāj wanted to win over Dayānanda to their society.[28] But the Brāhma Samāj did not accept the infallibility of the Vedas or the transmigration of souls, as it was pledged to the negation of both; on the other hand, Dayānanda could not ignore either. There seems to be no doubt that whichever side might have made the first approach, there was some sort of negotiation, but it foundered on his doctrine of the infallibility of the Vedas to which reference will be made later. But Dayānanda's association with the leaders of the Brāhma Samāj produced one good result. Keshabchandra Sen suggested to him the supreme importance of carrying on propaganda in the language of the people; he gratefully accepted it and made Hindī the vehicle of his teaching. After spending another two years in preaching his doctrines from place to place he proceeded to Bombay where the first Ārya Samāj was established on 10 April, 1875.

During the remaining eight years of his life Dayānanda devoted himself to preaching his new gospel, writing books embodying his teachings, and organizing Ārya Samājas throughout India. He toured extensively over all parts of India except Madras, translated the

Vedas and wrote three books: (1) *Satyārtha Prakāś*, in Hindī; (2) *Veda-Bhāshya Bhūmikā*, an introduction to his Vedic commentary, partly in Sanskrit and partly in Hindī; and (3) *Veda-Bhāshya*, a Vedic commentary in Sanskrit on the *Yajurveda* and major part of the *Ṛigveda*. His mission proved very successful in the Panjāb, and to a certain degree also in U. P., Rajputāna and Gujarāt. But at the time of his death in 1883, the total membership of the Ārya Samāj did not probably exceed twenty thousand. In the census of 1891 it was less than forty thousand.

2. *The Ārya Samāj.*

The constitution which was drawn up for the Ārya Samāj on the occasion of its foundation in Bombay in 1875 laid down some of the fundamental doctrines and rules of conduct. Three of these may be noted below:

1. The (Ārya) Samāj shall regard the Vedas alone as independently and absolutely authoritative.

2. Every member shall cheerfully contribute a hundredth part of the money he has earned towards the fund of the Samāj, the Ārya Vidyālaya and the *Ārya Prakāś* paper.

3. The Vedas and the ancient *Arsha granthas* shall be studied and taught in the Ārya Vidyālaya, and true and right training, calculated to improve males and females, shall be imparted, on Vedic lines.

Two years later (1877) this creed and constitution were replaced by the Ten Principles. Instead of No. 1 above it was simply laid down that the Vedas are the Books of True Knowledge which the members should study. The other nine principles merely inculcated virtue and morality to which no religion can possibly take any exception. Dayānanda believed, like Rājā Rāmmohan Roy, that the reform of Hindu society could only be effected by reviving Vedic rituals and institutions which had been hidden under the excrescences of the later Purānic age. So he adopted a programme of social reform. He rejected the hereditary system of caste and did not recognize the authority or even superiority of the Brāhmans merely on the ground of birth. He proclaimed the right of everybody to study the Vedas and other Hindu scriptures. He denounced the worship of gods and goddesses and preached that only the Supreme Being should be worshipped. Inter-caste marriage was encouraged and child-marriage was decried—the minimum marriageable age for boys and girls being fixed, respectively, at 25 and 16. Dayānanda was, however, opposed to the remarriage of widows. He held that ordinarily neither widower nor widow should remarry, but this rule may be relaxed, in letter or spirit, in the case of both. So he would permit a childless husband to remarry and a widow to procreate sons by others according to the system of *niyoga* (levirate) prescribed in the Vedas. But this does not seem to have been carried out in practice.

The most characteristic feature of the Ārya Samāj is the emphasis it laid upon the work of *Śuddhi*. This means the reconversions of those Hindus—millions in number—who had once been willingly or forcibly converted into other religions like Islam or Christianity, but were now willing to come back to the fold of Hinduism. Orthodox Hinduism had always barred its door against them; the Ārya Samāj threw it wide open. As a matter of fact, this aspect of the Ārya Samāj excited the greatest interest in it among the people outside its own ranks. It was strongly resented by the Muslims and was a source of almost chronic feud between the two. At the same time the *Śuddhi* was looked upon by the Ārya Samāj as a potent instrument for effecting that religious, social, and political unity of India which came to be cherished as its great ideal by the Ārya Samāj.

Two distinctive features of the Ārya Samāj are social services like famine-relief, and the spread of English education. The Dayānanda Anglo-Vedic School at Lahore, soon developed into a college, has become the pattern of many educational institutions maintained by the Ārya Samāj. The curriculum in these colleges was not exactly in the original spirit of Dayānanda, and so the more orthodox section founded the Gurukul at Haridwār. It is a unique institution to perpetuate the educational ideals of ancient India. But the D.A.V. (Dayānanda Anglo-Vedic) College at Lahore has also great achievements to its credit. Under Lālā Hansrāj, who remained its Principal for 28 years, "it became the foremost agency for planting a sturdy and independent nationalism in the Punjab".

3. *The great split*

There was a serious split in the Ārya Samāj in 1892, ostensibly on the difference of views on the two following questions:

1. The righteousness of meat diet.

2. The lines on which the D.A.V. College, founded in 1886 in memory of Dayānanda, was to be conducted.

These differences were, however, based on some fundamental principles. The unorthodox party pointed out that although Dayānanda had expressed an opinion unfavourable to meat diet, the Ten Principles which formed the basic doctrine of the Ārya Samāj were quite silent about it The members, it was argued, need believe in the Ten Principles only and in nothing else, and the Samāj had no right to question the individual's right of judgment in matters not strictly covered by the Ten Principles. It was argued by one of the most trusted disciples of Dayānanda that the great leader had wisely excluded from the Ten Principles the doctrinal principles and philosophical questions, so that the members may enjoy freedom of thought.

The orthodox party, on the other hand, held that the teachings of Dayānanda, though not embodied in the Ten Principles, constituted the creed of the Ārya Samāj, for all practical purposes. They maintained that so long as a greater authority on the Vedas was not born, the Ārya Samāj was bound by the teachings of Dayānanda and by his interpretation of the Vedas.

The true ring of liberalism in the voice of the unorthodox party is likely to draw public sympathy towards it. It is to be remembered, however, that if their views are to be carried to their logical conclusion, there would be hardly any *raison d'être* for the Ārya Samāj as a separate organization. The Ten Principles are worded in such a way that no Hindu can possibly take exception to them, and there is nothing in them which can serve as a bond of union to the extent of a cohesive organization. Dayānanda himself refused to join hands with the Brāhma Samāj,—though there were many points of agreement—because the latter did not accept the infallibility of the Vedas and the doctrine of transmigration of souls. Yet neither of these two finds place in the Ten Principles. To any impartial observer it would appear that it is the doctrine preached by Dayānanda, rather than the Ten Principles, which gave the dynamic force to the Ārya Samāj and made it what it is today. One might go even further and say that the seeming obscurantism or rigidity of Dayānanda's teachings really imparted to the Ārya Samāj that character and drive which made it a powerful national force. In view of its great importance this point requires a little elucidation.

The absolutely authoritative character of the Vedas, and *Vedas alone*, formed the fundamental creed of Dayānanda. At first he included within the Vedas both Brāhmaṇas and Upanishads, but when it was pointed out that the Upanishads themselves repudiated the authority of the Vedas as the highest or the only revelation, Dayānanda modified his views. Ultimately the Saṁhitā portion of the Vedas, and particularly the *Ṛigveda Saṁhitā*, was alone held to be the real Vedic revelation, at least for all practical purposes.[29]

In accepting the Vedas as the only authority Dayānanda was practically on a line with Rājā Rāmmohan Roy. But while the Rājā "accepted the authority of the Vedas as interpreted by the exegetics and apologetics of ancient Hinduism",[30] Dayānanda altogether rejected the commentaries of Sāyaṇa and Mahīdhara and did not consider any other commentary as binding on anyone.[31] Dayānanda therefore gave his own interpretation, and though theoretically every member of the Ārya Samāj was free to form his own conclusions, in practice, the *Saṁhitā* of the *Ṛigveda, as interpreted by Dayānanda* in his books mentioned above, formed the bed-rock on which stood the entire structure of the Ārya Samāj. His interpretation, which is supposed to contain the whole truth, differs in many cases fundamentally not only from that of modern scholars but also from the old Indian commentaries. To take an extreme example, *Ṛigveda* 1, 2, 7, which is usually regarded as an invocation to Mitra and Varuṇa, is translated by Dayānanda to mean that 'water is generated by the combination of hydrogen and oxygen'. Such interpretations and Dayānanda's claim that the Vedas alone are authoritative, have a deep significance which has thus been explained:

> "....The nature of scriptural authority in Hindu culture differed from the scriptural authority recognised by the other great world religions in this, namely, that while Christianity or Islam claimed more or less exclusive divine authority for their own books, the Vedas never put up any such claim. Modern Hinduism suffered in some sense from a great disability, as compared to Christianity and Islam, owing to the universal character of their scriptures, particularly of the Vedas. Dayananda Saraswati recognised this disadvantage and was evidently moved by the militant spirit of evangelical Christianity and Islamic missionary propaganda to create and foster a similar militancy in Hinduism itself. He was, therefore, moved to advance for the Vedas exactly the same kind of supernatural authority and exclusive revelation, which was claimed by the Christians for their Bible, and by the Muslims for their Quran. In this Dayananda Saraswati practically made a new departure from the line of ancient Hindu Fathers, from Jaimini and Vyasa to Raja Ram Mohan; and at the same time practically denied the very fundamentals of modern world-thought. But even by thus deviating from the ancient line of Hindu evolution he rendered an immense service to the new nationalist movement in India. He saw that both Christianity and Islam were making fatal inroads upon Hinduism. He realised that unless this process of conversion to Christianity and Islam of increasing numbers of Hindus could be stopped, India would cease in course of time to be the land of the Hindus, the main body of the people being divided into Moslems and Christians, Moslems

in Upper India and Christians in the South. Christianity and Islam must, therefore, be fought with their own weapons, and Hinduism must find this weapon in the Vedas, proclaimed as an exclusive revelation without which there is and can be no salvation for man, whatever may be his country. Christian and Islamic universalism is based upon the universality and infallibility of the Christian and the Islamic scriptures. Whoever accepts the authority of the Bible and the doctrine of salvation through Christ proclaimed by the Bible becomes entitled to enter the Kingdom of Heaven absolutely regardless of his birth or parentatge or his native country. It is so with Islam....We had nothing like it in ancient or mediaevel Hinduism. Hinduism believes in the universality of man's salvation. It believes in the universality of God's love and grace....And as Hinduism never conceived of a heaven to which Hindus alone would be entitled to enter or of a hell to which all non-Hindus would be condemned, it never set up the dogma of infallible scriptural authority familiar to credal systems like Christianity or Islam. Dayananda was, however, profoundly influenced by what might be called the credal universalism of Christianity and Islam to seek for the foundations of it in his own national religion. This was, it seems to me, the real psychology of the doctrine of Vedic infallibility set up by Dayananda Saraswati, upon which he wanted to build up the Hindu society and the Hindu nation inspired with a great mission among the peoples of the world. ....The *Satyarth-Prakash,* which contains the teachings of Dayananda, clearly proves this interpretation of the psychology of the Arya Samaj. Whatever may be the philosophical value of these teachings, and however much these may be discordant with some of the bedrock doctrines and ideals of Hindu Universalism, it cannot be denied that the movement of Dayananda Saraswati, as organised in the Arya Samaj, has contributed more than the rational movement of the Raja's Brahmo Samāj to the development of a new national consciousness in the modern Hindu, particularly in the Punjab. It was no small thing for the Hindu suffering for centuries under what the psychologists now call the 'inferiority complex', to be able to challenge aggressive Christianity and Islam by setting up this dogma of Vedic infallibility against their dogma of supernatural revelation; while at the same time he was able to appeal to the social economy of the Vedic Hindu not only to remove the numerous social disabilities under which the present day Hindu laboured, but also to claim a social order based upon the teachings of the Vedas which was from some points of view even superior to the advanced social idealism inspired by the dogma of Liberty, Equality and Fraternity of the French Illumination. India did not stand in need of going to Europe either for a purer religion or for a purer social order. This could be found in the ancient scriptures of the people themselves. This was really the beginning of that religious and social revival among the Hindus of India to which we owe so largely the birth of our present national consciousness".[32]

This view has considerable force.

IV. NEO-HINDUISM

Brāhmaism was the result of an effort to check Christianity and influence of Western ideas by emphasizing the essential principles of Hinduism. These were regarded as free from the evil accretions of a later date, which formed the chief target of attack by Christian missionaries and were held out to be opposed to the true spirit of Hinduism. This rationalistic attitude provoked a reaction in Bengal which gathered force in the second half of the nineteenth century, and gave rise to what may be called neo-Hinduism. Its common characteristic was the glorification of Hindu religion and society in their current forms, and a spirited defence of these against hostile criticism both by Indian reformers and European missionaries. It took various forms. An extreme point of view is represented by Pandit Śaśadhar Tarka-chūḍāmaṇi who addressed many public meetings in defence of popular Hindu ceremonialism, image-worship and current Hindu social institutions. He sought "to reconcile ancient Hindu ritualism and mediaeval Hindu faith with modern science". No one would be disposed today to put much value on his arguments. But, as Mr. B. C. Pal observes from his personal experience, "all the same it went down with large numbers of our country-men", who felt a new pride in their culture.[33]

Kṛishṇa-prasanna Sen represented a more popular, but less refined, aspect of this school. "One of his most popular presentations of the superiority of Hinduism was a pun on the words 'God' in English representing the Supreme Being and 'Nanda-Nandana' in Sanskrit and Bengalee, representing the Vaishnavic Deity Shri Krishna. 'If you reversed the alphabets composing the word God you would find it converted into dog; if you reversed the letters Nanda-Nandana in this way, you would find no change in it".[34] This was a typical presentation of Kṛishṇa-prasanna Sen. "He was sentimental, vulgar and abusive, but this very sentimentality, vulgarity and abuse went down with a generation of half-educated Bengalees who had been wounded in their tenderest spots by the vulgarities of the Anglo-Indian politicals of the type of Branson and ignorant and unimaginative Christian propagandists".[35]

The other extreme of this neo-Hinduism is represented by Bankim-chandra Chatterji, perhaps the greatest intellectual giant of this period. He "openly attempted a 're-examination, a re-interpretation and a re-adjustment' of our old theology and ethics in the light of the most advanced modern thought and in accordance with the new rules of literary criticism and scriptural interpretation that had been so powerfully influencing current religious life and thought in Christendom itself".[36] His classical work in this field was a biography of Lord Kṛishṇa, whose early life, particularly amours with the cowherd girls, formed a subject of cheap criticism, satire, and vehement denunciation, not only by Christian missionaries but also by a number of Indian rationalists. Bankim-chandra has tried to prove, by following historical method, that Kṛishṇa was the Ideal Man. Here, again, it is futile to argue about the correctness of Bankim-chandra's method or conclusions. Kṛishṇa is regarded as the full incarnation of God by the Hindus. The resuscitation of his moral character and personality from the gross abuses of modern calumniators by one of the greatest intellects of the age had a tremendous effect on the orthodox Hindus, and increased their self-confidence beyond measure. It strengthened the Hindu revivalist movement and helped the growth of the nascent national sentiment.

An intermediate position between the two extremes is occupied by two persons, the poet Nabīn-chandra Sen and the essayist Bhūdev Mukhopādhyāy. Nabīn-chandra sought to re-interpret the Purāṇas in the light of western science and humanism. Bhūdev also upheld the Puranic religion but laid special stress on preserving the Hindu social institutions some of which were the principal targets of attack. Both of them were highly proficient in English literature and brought a high degree of western rationalism in supporting their standpoint.

V. RAMAKṚISHṆA MAṬH AND MISSION

1. *Rāmakṛishṇa Paramahaṁsa.*[37]

Gadādhar Chattopādhyāya, who was known in later life as Rāmakṛishṇa Paramahaṁsa, was born in 1836 in a poor Brahman family in a small village called Kāmārpukur in the District of Hooghly in West Bengal. For the sake of convenience he may be referred to as Rāmakṛishṇa even before he formally came to be designated as such. His early boyhood was spent in the village and he got a very rudimentary training in the three R's in the village school. His formal education did not proceed much further beyond this elementary stage as he had no liking for school and enjoyed far more the society of the *sādhus* or ascetics who passed through the village. For he was of a religious and contemplative mood, and is said to have occasionally fallen into trances even from the early age of six. At the age of about seventeen he came to Calcutta, and three or four years later (1856), he adopted the vocation of a priest in the temple of Goddess Kālī, founded a short while ago by an aristocratic lady named Rāsmaṇi, at Dakshinesvar, on the bank of the Gaṅgā about five miles to the north of Calcutta. This was the turning-point in the life of Rāmakṛishṇa. While serving as priest he was gradually seized with the idea that the Goddess Kālī, whose idol he worshipped, was not an image of clay, but the Goddess herself, personified. He looked upon Kālī as a visible deity who should talk with him and share his joys and sorrows. This idea became an obsession with him. He could not follow the normal procedure of worship, but became God-intoxicated and yearned with his whole soul for the realization of God or ultimate reality. In this, he is believed to have succeeded. For, later in life, when questioned by his famous disciple Narendranāth (Swami Vivekānanda), he told him that he had seen God, as will be related later.

According to the account of his devotees based on what they heard from him, he reached this stage fairly early, not long after he became a priest or worshipper of Kālī. Novertheless, we find him making an earnest endeavour to realize God in various aspects. He led a God-centred life characterized by constant search for, and continuous approach to God, through various modes prescribed by tradition. All the while he lived as an ordinary man in Dakshinesvar; but though he was in the world, he was not of the world. From an early period he showed the characteristics of the state of mind, known in religious parlance as *divyonmāda*, God-centred frenzy, which puzzled everybody. He sometimes discarded clothes, and taking money in one hand and a clod of earth in the other, used to say, 'money is earth, earth is money'. These and other eccentricities need not be described in detail, and in the light of later events can only be looked upon as spiritual powers latent in him. The crucial fact remains that his early life shows no preparations for reaching this stage of God-intoxication or attaining this spiritual urge. It seems as if he was born with that spirituality which others acquire by exertion. For, if the accounts be true, he secured in an incredibly short time, sometimes in a few days, success or salvation in each mode of *sādhanā* (religious exercise) which others, including his *gurus* who initiated him, failed to attain even after many years of intense exertion. One of his *gurus*, Totā-purī, exclaimed in surprise that he reached in one day that state of *nirvikalpa samādhi* which he himself could attain only after forty years of rigorous asceticism. The same thing was true in respect of all the modes of *sādhanās* which he followed in search of God.

It is difficult for a layman to trace in detail the various kinds or stages of the *sādhanā* (search for God) which he performed during the first eleven or twelve years of his stay in the temple (1855-67); but we may state a few essential facts known on fairly good authority.

From the very beginning he used to retire at night to the jungle outside the temple, and sat there in deep meditation under the shade of a tree. At day-time he used to cry piteously to the Goddess in the temple to have a direct vision of her. "His whole soul, as it were, melted into one flood of tears, and he appealed to the Goddess to have mercy on him and reveal Herself to him." In his extreme distress at this desire not being fulfilled, one day he rushed and seized a dagger in the temple in order to kill himself, when he lost all sensation and saw the Goddess Kālī in a vision. Henceforth he was almost always in a state of frenzy. He discarded the formal rites and ceremonies of worship which a priest was expected to perform and behaved like a child to his mother, often crying with anguish of heart to get again a vision of the Goddess. The visions were repeated and his trances became longer and longer in duration. At last things came to such a pass that he was regarded as mad and was relieved of his formal duty as a priest. He went back home and was married, at the age of 24, to a girl of five. But shortly after marriage he returned to Dakshinesvar temple. Then began that *tapasyā* or ascetic exercises which lasted for nearly twelve years. Looking back to this period of his life he said later that a great religious tornado, as it were, raged within him during these years and made everything topsy-turvy. First he met a Bhairavī, a Brāhmaṇa lady who had practised *yoga* and was roaming at large in the red garb of an ascetic (*sannyāsinī*). She told the people that what they regarded as eccentricities or signs of madness in Rāmakṛishṇa were really the physical manifestations which are noticed in an ardent lover of God, and she proved it by citing incidents from Chaitanya's life as recorded in the Vaishṇava scriptures. The Bhairavī herself initiated Rāmakṛishṇa into the Tāntrik mode of *sādhanā*. He practised it for two years and passed successfuly through all the stages. He then followed the mode of *sādhanā* laid down by the Vaishṇava cult and is said to have obtained a vision of Kṛishṇa. He was next formally initiated into ascetic life by Totā-purī, a great saint who had realized in his life the highest truths of Vedānta, and practised the Vedāntic *sādhanā*. Rāmakṛishṇa was then initiated into the *Sūfī* doctrine of Islām and followed all the rites prescribed by that religion. He ate and dressed like a Muslim, offered regular prayers to Allāh, ceased to visit Hindu temples, and in three days obtained the vision of God. Later, he practised similar *sādhanā* according to Christian rite, and on the third day obtained the vision of Jesus Christ. Shortly before this, his wife Sāradāmaṇi came to Dakshinesvar, walking on foot all the way from her village home—a distance of thirty to forty miles. Rāmakṛishṇa received her kindly, but said he could not look upon her as his wife and saw in her the Goddess Kālī. So saying, he addressed her as mother and worshipped her with flowers and incense. But Sāradā was the worthy wife of a worthy husband. She said, she wanted nothing from him as her husband; but he should teach her how to realize God and allow her to stay with him to cook his meals and look to his health and comfort. This arrangement continued till the last day of Rāmakṛishṇa's life, a detached room outside the temple compound being set apart for her residence. However strange all these might appear to us, the different forms of the religious practices by Rāmakṛishṇa are vouched for by reliable evidence. He was occupied with them for about twelve years from 1856 to 1867. Then the storm-tossed soul found peace at last. After a short pilgrimage for a period of four months in course of which he visited Vaidyanāth, Vārānasi, Prayāg (Allāhābād), and Vrindāban he returned to Dakshinesvar. His name and fame as a great saint, who possessed wonderful spiritual powers and realized God, spread in all directions and attracted pious devotees to his small room within the precincts of the Dakshinesvar temple on the banks of the Gangā. Even the renowned Brāhma leader Keshab-chandra Sen visited him and became his admirer. Keshab, or one of his followers at his instance, published a short sketch of the life and sayings of Rāmakṛishṇa. All this created great interest in wider and wider circles and highly educated men and women of all ranks of life began to visit Dakshinesvar temple in ever increasing number to get a vision of the wonderful *yogin* and hear his religious discourse. Rāmakṛishṇa also did not spare himself, and for hours—sometimes literally from morning till evening, occasionally even at night—talked with the assembled people in his characteristic manner about the knowledge *(jñāna)* of, and devotion (*bhakti*) to God and narrated his own experience of spiritual life. Many, who attained to fame in later life, visited him, the greatest of them being a young Bengali graduate, Narendra-nāth Datta, better known as Svāmī Vivekānanda. Though *Ṭhākur* Rāmakṛishṇa Paramahaṁsa—as he then began to be called—sometimes visited Calcutta and saw some distinguished persons of the time, his life was mostly spent in Dakshinesvar, surrounded by an ever increasing number of devotees who were charmed and ennobled by his religious discourses in the form of short pithy phrases punctuated by appropriate anecdotes and illustrations from daily life. He never gave what may be called religious lectures, and founded no sect or *āśram*. People who flocked to him were mere visitors leading household life and returning home after the visit was over. Some of them, being of ascetic temperament, were more intimate with the saint and came to him more frequently, but their number was very small; they were not regularly initiated by Rāmakṛishṇa and did not formally renounce their life as householders.

It is not possible here to give a detailed account of this type of life which Rāmakṛishṇa led for nearly twenty years till he was attacked by cancer. On 16 August, 1886, he left this mortal frame and entered the final *samādhi* (trance) from which there is no return to earthly life.

Rāmakṛishṇa is one of the few religious leaders and ascetic saints of the highest order of whom we possess so much authentic contemporary account. It is not therefore difficult to describe the essential characteristics of his life and teachings.

The first thing that strikes one is his spiritual life and God-consciousness. He fell into ecstatic trances on merely hearing of God or thinking of Him. An eye-witness describes it as follows.

"During the state of samādhi he was totally unconscious of himself and of the outward world. At one time he fell down upon a piece of live coal during this stage. It burned deep into his flesh, but he did not know for hours, and the surgeon had to come in to extract the coal, when he came back to consciousness, and felt the wound."[38] It has again and again been witnessed by many that his body was very sensitive and immediately reacted to the touch of anything impure. Once a woman touched her feet and be automatically shrank back, and it was later found out that she was a bad sort. Like many other saints, he had aversion to wealth and refused with scorn the gift of money and costly things. But what was peculiar in him is that he could not bear the touch of gold or silver coins, and 'a simple touch, even when he was asleep, would produce physical contortions'.[39] He was renunciation incarnate, and detachment from everything was the chief tenor of his life.

Strange fits of God-consciousness often came upon him. He would then speak of himself as being able to do and know everything and even declare himself to be the same soul that had been born before as Rāma, as Kṛishṇa, as Jesus, or as Buddha. He had told Mathur Babu long before that many disciples would come to him shortly and he knew all of them.[39a] At sight he could read the souls of those who approached him. The moment he saw Narendranāth (future Vivekānanda) he instinctively felt that he was the man of destiny that would carry his spiritual message to all the world. According to a well-authenticated story, to be related later, Rāmakṛishṇa, shortly before his death, transmitted all his spiritual powers to Vivekānanda, who, when at the height of his power and glory, used to say that Rāmakṛishṇa could create hundreds of Vivekānanda if he willed. Rāmakṛishṇa seemed to possess the intuitive knowledge of good and evil. One day Rāsmaṇi, his patroness *Zamindar,* while listening to his discourse in the temple, became absent-minded at the thought of a law-suit in which she was engaged, with a huge amount at stake. Rāmakṛishṇa slapped her on the face, saying: "What! thinking of material things even here?"

Though Rāmakṛishṇa had not studied the Vedānta philosophy, he lucidly expounded its abstruse teachings. What is more, he was thoroughly imbued with the spirit of that philosophy in his life and teachings.

As a practical application of Vedānta, Rāmakṛishṇa realized divinity in humanity and emphasized the service of mankind as a means to salvation. This will be described more fully in connection with Vivekānanda.

The most characteristic trait of his teachings is that he expressed the highest wisdom or greatest truth in simple sentences and parables. The theme of all his discourses was the realization of God as the highest human ideal, attainable only by development of high spiritual life. This was only possible by discarding desire for material prosperity (*vishaya-vāsanā*) and lure for gold and women (*kāminī-kañchana*), and turning all thoughts and actions towards God. But this did not require the renunciation of worldly life which is fully compatible with spiritual development if the aim of realizing God is steadily kept in view, and the Ultimate Reality—Soul or God—, as distinct from the evanescent world, is never lost sight of. When asked, how passion can be eliminated, his reply was, why should it be eliminated? Give it a new turn and direct it towards God. All this idea was illustrated by several parables, two of which may be quoted:

"As a wet-nurse in a rich family brings up the child of her master, loving the baby as if it were her own, but knows well that she has no claim upon it; so think ye also that you are but trustees and guardians of your children whose real father is the Lord God in Heaven".

"As an unchaste woman, busily engaged in household affairs, is all the while thinking of her secret lover, even so, O! thou man of the world, do thy round of wordly duties, but fix thy heart always on the Lord".[40]

Rāmakṛishṇa regarded the development of character as superior to knowledge. "It is useless to pore over holy scriptures and sacred *Śāstras* without a discriminating and dispassionate mind. No spiritual progress can be made without discrimination (*viveka*) and dispassion (*vairāgya*)."[41] Though preaching against carnal passion Rāmakṛishṇa did not hate women nor tried to avoid them as source of evils. "One day, when the discussion turned to the need of celibacy, Hari said with an air of bravado, 'Oh, I hate women, I cannot even bear their presence'. Instead of encouraging him, the Master came out with the sharp rebuke, "How foolish! What do you mean by hating women? They are the representations of the Mother of the universe. You should look upon them as your mother and honour them".[42]

Thus both by precept and example of his own life Rāmakṛishṇa brought home to an incredulous world, then under the spell of natural science, the reality of spiritual life. He brought it from heaven to earth below. This seems to be his greatest contribution to the modern world. Spiritual life and the means to attain it were described in ancient Hindu scriptures, but they were either forgotten or disbelieved, and nothing but an actual vision of it in Rāmakṛishṇa could have impressed upon the modern Hindu minds the real meaning, nature, and value of this great treasure of ancestral knowledge. Rāmakṛishṇa was a visible embodiment of the spiritual attainments of India during three thousand years.

Next in importance is the revelation of the harmony of all religions. He demonstrated by precept and example that all the different religions are true in their essence, and may lead to salvation if properly pursued. He himself demonstrated, by experiment, the efficacy of the diverse modes of *sādhanā* or spiritual discipline prescribed by different religions. His pithy saying that the different creeds are but different paths to reach the same God (*Yata mat tata path*) puts on a high pedestal the virtue of toleration and reverence for all religions. He made his own life a laboratory for the synthesis of different systems of religion;—a wonderful synthesis of higher forms of spiritual discipline with rituals and ceremonies; of *sākāra* (God with form) with *nirākāra* (God without form); of Vedānta with devotion; of rationalism with emotion and intuition; of asceticism with social and domestic life. He was a store-house of spiritual powers —like electricity—which might generate various types of energies or powers for various kinds of use leading ultimately to the spiritual uplift of the whole world.

He was asked: "If the God of every religion is the same, why is it then that the God is painted differently by different religionists"? He answered: "God is one, but His aspects are different: as one master of the house is father to one, brother to another, and husband to a third, and is called by these different names by those different persons, so one God is descrbed and called in various ways according to the particular aspect in which He appears to His particular worshipper. In a potter's shop there are vessels of different shapes and forms—pots, jars, dishes, plates, &c.—but all are made of one clay. So God is one, but is worshipped in different ages and countries under different names and aspects".[43] This catholicity of views may be regarded as another great contribution of Rāmakṛishṇa to the modern world which religion has divided into so many water-tight compartments. It had a special significance for the orthodox Hindus. The worship of images, even of Goddess Kālī, which was the butt of ridicule by the Christian missionaries as well as Indian reformers, was demonstrated by Rāmakṛishṇa to be not only not incompatible with the highest spiritual development, but also as good a means of salvation as the worship of one God without any form. "Many are the names of God, and infinite the forms that lead us to know Him. In whatsoever name or form you desire to call Him, in that very form and name you will see Him". This teaching of Rāmakṛishṇa, supported by parables, and tested by his own life, gave the Hindu Revivalism a moral sanction, a philosophical basis, and a new spiritual significance of immense value.

2. *Svāmī Vivekānanda*

The greatest disciple of Rāmakṛishṇa Paramahaṁsa was a young Bengali graduate named Narendra-nāth Datta, who, as Svāmī Vivekānanda, was destined to carry the message of his Master *(guru)* all over India and in Europe and America. Born on January 12, 1863, in a Kāyastha family in Calcutta, Narendra got English education in school and college. He was first attracted to the Brāhma Samāj and then drank deeply into the philosophy of John Stuart Mill, Hume and Herbert Spencer; but he found no peace; his soul craved for something more. Towards the end of 1881, when he had appeared in the First Examination in Arts of the Calcutta University, he was persuaded by a relative to visit Rāmakṛishṇa at Dakshinesvar. The latter drew him aside and said with tears in his eyes: "Ah, you come so late......you are the incarnation of Nārāyaṇa, born on earth to remove the miseries of mankind". Narendra-nāth was taken aback, and doubted the sanity of the saint. But he put the question that had been agitating him for some time past. "Sir, have you seen God?" "Yes", was the instant reply, "I see Him just as I see you, only in a much intenser sense. God can be realized. One can see and talk with Him as I am doing with you". After the interview Narendra summed up his estimation of the Master thus: "Even if insane, this man is the holiest of the holy, a true saint, and for that alone he deserves the reverent homage of mankind".

"The second meeting was more interesting. Srī Rāmakṛishṇa affectionately seated Narendra by his side and quickly placed his right foot on the latter's body. Narendra described the subsequent experience thus: 'With my eyes open, I saw the walls and everything in the room whirling rapidly away and vanishing into naught, and the whole universe, together with my individuality, was about to be engulfed in an all-embracing mysterious void'. Unable to bear this, he cried out, 'What is it that you are doing to me! I have my parents at home.' The Master laughed out aloud and said, 'All right, let it rest now'. And Narendra was himself again."[44]

It is not possible to describe in detail how the mind of Narendra was gradually transformed by close contact with Rāmakṛishṇa, and two instances must suffice.

"One day, some time in 1884, the talk drifted to the Vaishṇava tenet. In the course of it the Master said: 'This religion enjoins upon its followers the practice of three things—delight in the name of God, compassion for all living creatures, and service to the devotees of Vishṇu'. Hardly had he finished when he fell into a trance. Then in a semi-conscious mood he said to himself, 'Compassion for creatures! Compassion for creatures! Thou fool! An insignificant worm crawling on the earth, thou to show compassion to others! Who art thou to show compassion? No, no, it is not compassion for others, but rather service to man, recognising him as the manifestation of God!' All heard this, but Narendra understood its implication. Outside the room he said to others, 'What a strange light I have discovered in those wonderful words of the Master! How beautifully he has reconciled the ideal of *Bhakti* (devotion) with the knowledge of Vedānta (Monism)! I have understood from these words of wisdom that the ideal of Vedānta, lived by the recluse outside the pale of society, can be practised at home and applied to all our daily concerns........It is He who has become all the different creatures—objects of our love; and yet He is beyond all these. Such realisation of Divinity in humanity leaves no room for egotism.....Service of man, knowing him to be the manifestation of God, purifies the heart, and such an aspirant quickly realises himself as part and parcel of God—Existence-Knowledge-Bliss. Well, if the Lord wills, the day will come when I shall proclaim this grand truth before the world at large. I shall make it the common property of all—the wise and the ignorant, the rich and the poor, the brahmin and the pariah".[45] The other incident relates how the Master took Narendra from the Monism of Vedānta to the worship of the images of God in spite of his Brāhma prejudices against idolatry. Reduced to extreme penury by the death of his father and failing to secure any job, Narendra asked Rāmakṛishṇa to intercede with the Divine Mother on his behalf. The latter said, "My boy, I can't make such requests. But why don't you go and ask the Mother yourself? All your sufferings are due to your disregard of Her". "So Narendra at last went to the Kāli temple, prostrated himself before the image, and forgetting all about his mission, like genuine spiritual aspirant, prayed, 'Mother, give me discrimination! Give me renunciation! Grant unto me knowledge and devotion! Ordain that I may have an unimpeded vision of Thee!' On his return, the Master found out what had taken place, and sent him to the temple a second and a third time. But Narendra fared no better. His mind was too highly tuned to ask for such paltry things from the Mother of the universe who was there to end all sense of want for ever......The whole of that night he sang of the Mother, only to fall asleep exhausted in the morning. The Master was so happy that Naren had accepted the Divine Mother."[46]

While Narendra and a few other select young men were slowly acquiring a spiritual outlook on life by the precepts and example of Rāmakṛishṇa, the latter fell ill and had to be removed from Dakshinnesvar, first to Calcutta and then to Kāsipur. In these two places, particularly at the Kāsipur Garden House, the young disciples gathered round the Master to serve him, and thus there grew up a sort of brotherhood. Shortly before his passing away Rāmakṛishṇa told Narenda: "I leave these boys to your care. See that they practise spiritual exercises even after my passing away and that they do not return home".

"Three or four days before the final departure, the Master called Narendra to his presence, and fixing his gaze on him fell into a trance. Narendra felt as though something like an electric current was flowing into him, and lost outer consciousness. When he came to, he found the Master weeping. On being asked the reason for this, the Master said, 'O Naren, today I have given you my all and have become a pauper! Through this power you will do great things, and only after that will you return to where you came from".[47]

After the Master had passed away, his young disciples were urged by their guardians and advised by others to go back home and resume their studies or other duties. Most of them dispersed, but Narendra stuck to the idea of setting up a fraternity of monks. By earnest efforts he induced three or four of his associates to leave home and live together in a dilapidated house at Barānagar near Kāsipur. Though faced with the twofold problem of helping his own starving family and maintaining the monastery, without any regular source of income, Narendra somehow solved both. Gradually the inmates of the monastery increased, and a few, including Narendra himself, stayed at home and came off and on. And so with less than a dozen all-renouncing enthusiasts, all English-educated Bengalis belonging to middle class families, with only one exception, the monastery started on its career.

Referring to these early days of the monastery, Vivekānanda said in later days: "We were Sannyāsins (hermits). We never thought of the morrow......We used to live on what chance brought. There were days at the Barānagore *Maṭh* when we had nothing to eat. If there was rice, salt was lacking........Leaves of the Bimba creeper boiled, salt and rice—this was our menu for months......We were being carried along on a strong tide of meditation and other religious practices. Oh, what days! Demons would have run away at the sight of such austerities, to say nothing of men."[48] It was not till some time after the monastery was established at Barānagar in A.D. 1887, that about a dozen inmates—all close associates of, and receiving their spiritual inspiration from, Rāmakṛishṇa—ceremonially accepted the vows of monasticism in a group by performing Vedic rites and accepting monastic names. This may be regarded as the formal inauguration of Rāmakṛishṇa Order. Henceforth the history of the Order centres round Narendranāth who, after two changes, finally adopted the name Vivekānanda, and was tacitly acknowledged to be the head of the small band of monks. He undertook a pilgrimage over North, West, and South India. This was a landmark in his career, for it brought him into intimate contact with the peoples of India and enabled him to realize the true condition of India as he had never done before. "And as a common feature of India as a whole, he found poverty, squalor, loss of mental vigour and hope for the future, disintegration of age-old institutions, conservatism trying to hold its own under the guise of spirituality and pseudo-reforms, lack of organised effort, and the waves of Western science and culture as well as Christianity beating furiously against her shores; in short, he found the glorious India of yore fallen and prostrate, the only hope being that she still held on to the one source of her life—her religion".[49] How to help India out of this morass, was the problem that deeply agitated him and henceforth this question was uppermost in his mind up to the end of his life. His mind was working on a somewhat vague plan of getting help for India from the West—not as a beggar, but in exchange for the spirituality which the West lacked and India alone could supply. The idea took shape when he heard of the Parliament of Religions where representatives of all religions from all over the world would assemble at Chicago (U.S.A.) on the occasion of the four hundredth anniversary of the discovery of America by Columbus. How this penniless, lonely monk succeeded in reaching the shores of the strange land and without being a delegate of any recognized body secured admission into the World Congregation of 1893 as a representative of Hinduism, reads more like a romance than historical fact. His success in the Parliament was immediate and absolute. His unusual form of greeting the audience as 'sisters and brothers of America' in his opening address was received with tremendous applause, and won him the love and respect of a section of the Americans which he never lost. The Svāmī spoke before the Parliament proper no less than five times, and also a number of times before the scientific section of the Parliament. In the opening address he spoke of the catholicity of Hinduism in whose dictionary the word 'intolerance' never found a place. His most significant address was his paper on Hinduism which he read on 19 September, 1893. Before reading the paper he made a few remarks which created great sensation in the American press. As they are not to be found in the official proceedings of the Parliament or in his biographies, but throw light on the trend of his political thought they are quoted below, as reported in the *Chicago Daily Tribune* of 20 September, 1893.

"We who come from the East have sat here on the platform day after day and have been told in a patronizing way that we ought to accept Christianity because Christian nations are the most prosperous. We look about us and we see England, the most prosperous Christian nation in the world, with her foot on the neck of 250,000,000 Asiatics. We look back into history and see that the prosperity of Christian Europe began with Spain. Spain's prosperity began with the invasion of Mexico. Christianity wins its prosperity by cutting the throats of its fellowmen. At such a price the Hindu will not have prosperity. I have sat here today and I have heard the height of intolerance. I have heard the creeds of the Moslems applauded, when today the Moslem sword is carrying destruction into India. Blood and sword are not for the Hindu, whose religion is based on the laws of love."

The reputation won by Vivekānanda through the Parliament of Religions made him a world figure and raised the prestige of India and Hinduism very high. He undertook a whirlwind lecture tour, at the rate of fourteen or more per week, and sowed the seeds of spirituality in American soil which germinated at no distant date and led to the establishment of several centres, on a permanent basis, for the study of Vedānta. From America the Svāmī visited London *via* Paris, and continued the work of lecturing. The great oriental scholar Max Müller was so deeply impressed by the account of Rāmakṛishṇa given by his greatest disciple, that he first published an article on Rāmakṛishṇa, entitled *A real Mahātman,* and then a biography, called *Rāmakṛishṇa—His Life and Sayings.* There are enough signs already that the sapling which Svāmī Vivekānanda planted in the West, would one day grow into a big banyan tree under whose cool shade the world may find refuge from its trials and tribulations.

Early in January, 1897, Svāmī Vivekānanda returned to India and was received with tremendous ovations everywhere he went, literally from Cape Comorin to the Himālayas. His grateful countrymen offered him homage of respect and reverence for what he had done to raise, almost overnight, his country and its culture in the estimation of the Western world. But Svāmījī knew that the real work lay before him. It was a tremendous work,—to uplift the masses by removing poverty and ignorance, infusing new vigour by invoking the spirit of equality, freedom, work and energy from the West, but without detriment to the religious culture and instincts, the spiritual heritage of the Hindus. Some of his ideas are best expressed in his own words: "Nations, like individuals, must help themselves". "Every nation, every man and every woman must work out their own salvation. Give them ideas—that is the only help they require—and then the rest will follow as the effect".[50] But India must not live in isolation from the rest of the world. "I am thoroughly convinced", said he, "that no individual or nation can live by holding itself apart from the community of others, and whenever such an attempt has been made under false ideas of greatness, policy or holiness—the result has always been disastrous to the secluding one." 'We are to give as well as take from others. We should give our ancient spirituality and culture and get in return Western science, technology, methods of raising the standard of life, business integrity and technique of collective effort.'[50a]

But though he stressed unflinching faith in Hindu religion, he did not take it in a narrow spirit. He denounced 'Dont-touch-ism' and insisted on raising the status of women and the masses, for he attributed the degeneration of India to the suppression of such large sections of humanity. The masses must be elevated by means of education based on religion, and the caste must be restored to its original foundation, namely, quality of head and heart and not mere accident of birth. But all these must proceed cautiously step-by step. "Do not figure out high plans at first, but begin slowly. Feel your ground and proceed up and up".

But all these merely indicate one aspect of Vivekānanda. We must take note of the other aspect also—the monk Vivekānanda. By the time he returned to India, the monastery had been removed from Barānagar to Ālambāzār, but its monastic members were scattered abroad in different parts of India. Vivekānanda gave new life to the monastery and it was ultimately removed to Belur, at its present site, at the beginning of 1899. Definite rules were laid down for the guidance of the monks. Two papers—the monthly *Prabuddha Bhārata* in English, and *Udbodhana*, a Bengali fortnightly—were started and Vivekānanda's lectures were published in several volumes—*My Master, Jñānayoga, Rājayoga, Karmayoga, Bhaktiyoga,* etc. He wrote, besides, numerous treatises. The result of all this was the rapid growth of monasteries all over India.

But Vivekānanda did not rest content with the establishment of the old type of monastery, merely as a centre of spiritual culture, highly valuable though it was. He added to it a section for the social service, so dear to his heart, as an integral part of his life's work. The genesis of the idea is thus described by Swāmī Brahmānanda, a close associate and apostolic successor of Vivekānanda. "During his travel in the Western Ghats and the Mahrāttā province, Swāmiji used to shed tears at the poverty of the common people and the oppression of the rich. He said to us, 'Mark it, my brothers, in the prevailing state of poverty in this country, the time is not opportune for preaching religion. I shall talk of religion if I ever succeeded in removing the poverty and misery of the country. That is why I am going to the land of Croesus, to try my luck to find some way out".[51] On his way to America he wrote from Yokohama on 10 July, 1893, to his Madras disciples: "How many men—unselfish, thorough-going men—is Madras ready now to supply, to struggle unto life and death to bring about a new state of things—sympathy for the poor, and bread to their hungry mouths, enlightenment to the people at large—and struggle unto death to make men of them who have been brought to the level of beasts by the tyranny of your forefathers?" In the same letter he says, "Kick out the priests". On October 27, 1894, appeared these lines: "Where should one go to seek for God? Are not all the poor, the miserable, the weak, God?"[52] When Svāmījī was still in America a brother monk wrote to him of the miseries of the people which he had witnessed during his journey through Gujarāt and Rājputāna, and asked for his advice. "The prompt reply came. 'The poor, the ignorant, the illiterate. the afflicted—let these be your God: know that service to these is the highest religion".[53] So the first social work began. After his return to India Vivekānanda himself took up the work in right earnest. In order to carry out the work in a systematic manner, a new organization, called Rāmakṛishṇa Mission, was instituted on 5 May, 1897. The organized social service began with the famine relief work in

Murshidābād and other places in 1897, followed by plague relief in Calcutta in 1898.

In the summer of 1899 Vivekānanda again visited America. The Vedānta Society of New York had been placed on a permanent footing. The Svāmī visited California and sowed the seeds of future Vedānta centres in Los Angeles and San Francisco. A Śānti Āśram (Peaceful Retreat) was established at San Antone Valley in California on a 160-acre plot of land donated by a pious lady. In all these places there were monks of the Rāmakṛishṇa Order, lecturing and taking classes. Vivekānanda was invited to the Congress of the History of Religions at Paris, and spoke there in defence of Hinduism. After a long tour of Europe he returned to India in December, 1900. But he had no rest. He took another strenuous tour in East Bengal, and on return to Belur celebrated the Durgā Pūjā in the Belur Maṭh according to Hindu scriptures. This removed the doubt and fear caused by his association with the foreigners and scheme of social reforms, and the people were convinced that he was Hindu to the backbone. As his health broke down, he went to Banaras for a change and there founded what was later known as the Rāmakṛishṇa Mission Home of Service. On return from Banaras to Calcutta, Svāmījī's health again broke down, and he passed away on 4 July, 1902.

Svāmī Vivekānanda could only lay the foundation of the great organization which bears the proud name of his *guru*. Its later growth, which made Rāmakṛishṇa Maṭh and Mission the greatest spiritual force in modern India, will form a subject for discussion in the next volume. The Svāmī never ceased to proclaim that in all that he did he merely followed in the footsteps of his *guru*. This may be quite true within a limit. But it is a debatable point whether Rāmakṛishṇa's teachings and their practical application in active life—both individual and social—would have made any material progress but for the dynamic energy and great personality of Vivekānanda. To give a concrete shape to Rāmakṛishṇa's spiritual teachings, to spread his mission all over the world, and place it on a stable basis—these are the greatest achievements to the credit of Vivekānanda.

The practical application of his *guru's* ideal of service, as interpreted by Svāmī Vivekānanda, paved the way for the regeneration of India. His valued contribution to the growth of nationalism in India will be discussed later. The work, begun by Raja Rāmmohan Roy, of rejuvenating the Indian life was considerably advanced by Svāmījī. To use Hegelian terminology, the reforms inaugurated by the Brāhma Samāj may be taken as representing the Thesis, the

Hindu Revivalism, the Antithesis, and the Rāmakṛishṇa-Vivekānanda Doctrine, the Synthesis. It combined the best elements of both and ensured all-round progress of Hindu religion and society without destroying its spiritual basis and essential spirit, and saving it from destruction by the reactionary elements. To the Hindus, Svāmījī has been a saviour and a reformer. The Rāmakṛishṇa Mission deserves great credit for placing Hinduism on a high pedestal and resisting the onslaughts of Christianity and Islam.

But Svāmī Vivekānanda had also an international or rather humanitarian outlook. With his unerring foresight he predicted the great crisis which faces the world today. He realized that a very critical situation would arise in the West, threatening its total destruction, owing to the rapid growth of material power and scientific inventions, unaccompanied by a corresponding growth of spiritual insight. India suffered, as her spiritual attainment far outstripped the material power which alone could sustain it. Swāmī Vivekānanda feared that the Western world would similarly suffer because her material power had far outstripped the spiritual attainments which alone could keep it within reasonable control. This lack of balance, he said, should be made good by mutual give and take between India and the West. But, he added, the West would not listen to the spiritual message of India so long as she continues in this abject condition of subjection and poverty. This is why he thought that the freedom of India and her material prosperity were needed for the salvation of the world.

Vivekānanda also predicted the great change that was coming over the world. In a broad survey of the progress of mankind through the ages he pointed out how the society was dominated successively by the Priests, the Nobility and the Merchants, corresponding to the first three castes of India, namely the Brāhmaṇa, Kshatriya, and the Vaiśya. Then he observed that the next or fourth epoch will be 'under the domination of Śūdra (the Proletariat)', the fourth caste. This upheaval, he asserted as far back as 1896, "will come from Russia or from China". "Perhaps", said he, "Russia will be the first Proletarian State in the world"—a prophecy that was fulfilled in twenty years' time.[53a] Vivekānanda asked the Indians to elevate their masses so that they might use their domination in a judicious manner to secure the welfare of their country.

VI. THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY.

The Theosophical Society was founded in the United States of America in 1875 by Madame H. P. Blavatsky (1831-91) and Colonel H. S. Olcott along with others. The main objects of the Society were three, namely,

1. To form a universal brotherhood of man.

2. To promote the study of ancient religions, philosophies and sciences.

3. To investigate the laws of nature and develop the divine powers latent in man.

The Brāhmanical and Buddhist literature supplied the terminology of the doctrines which were greatly influenced by occultist, Indian, and modern spiritualistic ideas and formulas.[54]

The theory of universal brotherhood was based upon the doctrine, familiar to students of Indian philosophy, of the 'One life' as the ultimate reality of which all creations are but different manifestations—the ultimate Oneness which underlies and sustains all phenomenal diversity.

The second object, the study of comparative philosophy and religion, soon crystallized itself into a dogmatic belief that all the different forms of religion were merely so many diverse expressions of one and the same fundamental truth called "Ancient Wisdom". A knowledge of this truth has been held as a sacred possession and trust for ages by certain mysterious adepts in occultism, or *Mahātmās,* an Indian term denoting great saints or saintly persons. Madame Blavatsky proclaimed that she was in psychical as well as in direct physical communication with these *Mahātmās.* This was proved by manifestations of "occult phenomena", witnessed by friends and associates of Madame Blavatsky, which, she declared, were the outcome of her connection with these *Mahātmās.*[55]

The fundamental philosophical doctrines of the Theosophical Society, such as *karma* and *nirvāṇa,* are common to both Buddhism and Brāhmanism, and no wonder, therefore, that the Indians should be attracted to it. But when Colonel Olcott and Madame Blavatsky came to Bombay and announced that the *Mahātmās,* referred to above, still lived in the inaccessible recesses of the Himālayas and guided the destinies of mankind by their psychic powers or soul force, the Indians welcomed the new message with great enthusiasm. There was, moreover, a special reason for the English-educated classes to welcome Theosophy. Most of them had no faith in the many current religious and social doctrines, customs, and traditions, but had not the courage to openly repudiate them for fear of social ostracism and other serious consequences that were sure to follow. These, "condemned to live in an agonising mental and moral conflict", found in Theosophy a "veritable gospel of peace and salvation".[56] For, by subtle philosophical theories of graded elevation of man by stages, Theosophy defended the current practices of Hinduism. It reconciled the ideal of universal brotherhood with the caste-system, and the fundamental unity of the Supreme Being with the worship of numerous gods and goddesses including the most recent additions to the Hindu pantheon. Nay, more; it held that even such practices as image-worship developed psychic forces. By these means Theosophy helped very materially to remove the "inferiority complex" from the minds of educated Indians. But Theosophy also did some good to them. The great work of Theosophy was "in the moral reclamation of many of these educated Hindus who readily accepted the somewhat rigid disciplines of the new cult that demanded of its votaries complete abstinence from intoxicating drinks and absolute social purity for the attainment of that high level of psychic and spiritual power which it promised".[57]

The Theosophical Society, however, did not enjoy its popularity for long. The alleged communication from the *Mahātmās* proved the most vulnerable point of attack. "Madame Blavatsky stoutly maintained that the *Mahātmās* exhibited their astral bodies" to her, and 'precipitated' messages which reached her from the confines of Tibet in an instant of time. In order to gain converts and confound the sceptics she made exhibition of her powers. These exhibitions of "psychical phenomena" were regarded by many as pure jugglery, and it is claimed by them that on three occasions her jugglery, though cleverly conceived, "was exposed in the most conclusive manner".[58] On the other hand, Mrs. Annie Besant, who guided the Theosophical Society for nearly half a century after Blavatsky's death and played a prominent role in Indian politics, made a convincing declaration in favour of the latter. Mrs. Besant was a highly educated and talented lady and her words deserve very careful consideration. She not only paid tributes of respect to the personality of Blavatsky but made the following statement in 1893 in regard to the much-vexed and disputed problem which had been agitating alike the friends and enemies of the Theosophical Society:

"I *know*, by personal experiment, that the Soul exists, and that my Soul, not my body, is myself; that it can leave the body at will; that it can, disembodied, reach and learn from living human teachers, and bring back and impress on the physical brain that which it has learned; that this process of transferring consciousness from one range of being, as it were, to another, is a very slow process, during which the body and brain are gradually correlated with the subtler form which is essentially that of the Soul, and that my own experience of it, still so imperfect, so fragmentary, when compared with the experience of the highly trained, is like the first struggles of a child learning to speak compared with the perfect oratory of the practised speaker; that consciousness, so far from being dependent on the brain, is more active when freed from the gross forms of matter than when encased within them; that the great Sages spoken of by H. P. Blavatsky exist; that they wield powers and possess knowledge before which our control of Nature and knowledge of her ways is but as child's play. All this, and much more, have I learned, and I am but a pupil of low grade, as it were, in the infant class of the Occult School;. . . ."[59]

Though the controversy and the so-called exposures of Blavatsky's jugglery considerably lowered the prestige and reduced the popularity of the Theosophical Society, still it continued as a powerful organization. When Madame Blavatsky died on 8 May, 1891, "at the theosophical headquarters in the Avenue Road, London, she was the acknowledged head of a community numbering not far short of 100,000, with journalistic organs in London, Paris, New York and Madras".[60]

In India the Theosophical Society fixed its headquarters at Adyar, a suburb of the city of Madras. Mrs. Annie Besant, who came to India in 1893, infused new life into the Society, and by the end of the first quarter of the twentieth century many distinguished Indians had become its members.

VII. MINOR RELIGIOUS MOVEMENTS

The religious movements in the 19th century followed three more or less well-defined courses, namely,

1. Reforms, which rejected some of the fundamental doctrines.
2. Defence of the old systems.
3. An intermediate course between the two.

The Brāhma Samāj, Prārthanā Samāj, and the Wahābī and Ahmadiya movements may be cited as examples of the first. To the same category perhaps belongs also the reform movement among the Parsi community. It was inaugurated by a number of English-educated Parsi young men who started, in 1851, the Rahnumai Mazdayasnan Sabhā, or Religious Reform Association, which had for its object "the regeneration of the social condition of the Parsis and the restoration of the Zoroastrian religion to its pristine purity." One of the leading personalities of this group, Dadabhai Naoroji, also played a distinguished role in the political regeneration of India as will be described later. The organ of this association was the *Rast Goftar* (Truth-teller) to which reference will be made later.

"These early reformers were very cautious, discreet, sagacious and tactful in their movement. They rallied round them as many Parsi leading priests of the day as they could and submitted to them in a well-formulated form specific questions under specific heads, asking their opinion if such and such practice, dogma, creed, ceremony, etc., were in strict conformity with the teachings of the religion of Zoroaster, or contravened those teachings. Fortified by these opinions, the reformers carried on their propaganda in the way of lectures, public meetings, pamphlets and articles in the *Rast Goftar*."[61]

A fillip was given to this movement by K. R. Cama who studied the *Avesta* in the original under some of the greatest scholars in Europe. On his return to Bombay in 1859 he began to teach the Parsi scriptures by the Western methods in order to create a new type of priests who would understand the real teaching of Zoroaster and free the Parsi community "from the thraldom of all those practices, rituals and creed for which there was no warrant within the four corners of the authentic Zoroastrian scriptures".[62]

The religious reform was accompanied by social reforms. Education of women was encouraged and made good progress; the *purdah* system was removed and Parsi women moved freely in public; and the age of marriage was gradually raised.

To the second of the above categories belongs the neo-Hinduism, seen at its best in the Rāmakṛishṇa Mission, mentioned above. The Theosophist movement also belongs to the same category. Various existing religious sects also reacted in the same way to the new spirit of the age. The Mādhvas of South India were bestirred to activity by Kanchi Sabba Raoji, a Deputy-Collector, and founded an association in 1877 with a view to stimulating the systematic study of Mādhva literature and thereby strengthening the sect.[63]

Another Vaishṇava sect, the Śrīvaishṇavas, also felt the urge of the modern spirit. Śrī A. Govindāchārya Svāmī of Mysore city wrote a large number of books, both in English and the vernacular, since 1898, to prove the great value of the teachings of Rāmānuja, the founder of the sect. In 1902 the Śrīvaishṇavas of Mysore formed an association, evidently in imitation of the Mādhvas.[64]

Similar movements were noticed among the followers of Chaitanya cult in Bengal which had languished very much in course of time. It resulted in a literary movement to rehabilitate the position of Kṛishṇa as the full incarnation of God and the author of the *Bhagavadgītā* against modern critics and Christian missionaries. The most outstanding literary work associated with this movement was the *Kṛishṇacharitra* of Bankim-chandra Chatterji. It is an effort, on modern critical line, to establish the historical character of Kṛishṇa, and to depict him as an ideal man. The great achievement of this new movement was to popularise the teachings of the *Gītā* or *Bhagavadgītā*, which is now recognized as a great religious treatise not only in India but throughout the world, and widely read in Europe and America. There is some truth in the comment of the Christian missionaries that the aim of the neo-Kṛishṇa movement in Bengal is "to persuade the Bengali to put Kṛishṇa in the place of Christ and the *Gītā* in the place of the Gospels". A Bengali who took to ascetic life under the name of Premānanda Bhāratī (usually called Bābā Bhāratī) "went to New York in 1902 and lectured on Kṛishṇa with great success not only in New York, but in Boston, Los Angeles (where he built a Hindu temple), and elsewhere."[65]

The Śaivas did not lag behind the Vaishṇavas in attempts to popularise and strengthen their position. Śaiva *Sabhās* were started in several localities. That of Palamcottah was founded in 1886, with the object of "the propagation of the principles of the Śaiva Siddhānta among Śaivas and others, the supervision of religious institutions, when funds are mismanaged, the cultivation of the Dravidian languages, and the betterment of social conditions in South India."[66]

The Liṅgāyats also followed suit. The Liṅgāyat Education Association was formed in 1884 for the promotion of modern education within the community. Since 1904 an All-India Liṅgāyat Conference meets annually to "discuss problems, both religious and secular, which affect the life and standing of the sect".[67]

The followers of the Tantra cult tried to defend their system, generally regarded as obscene by all outsiders, by writing books to prove that there was a great esoteric meaning behind the seemingly obnoxious or abominable practices. The Introduction to the English translation of the *Mahānirvāṇa Tantra*, the principal work of the sect, by M. N. Dutt is an attempt of this kind.[68]

Lastly, reference should be made to the militant orthodoxy of a section of the Smārtas. The name Smārta is applied to the followers of Śaṅkarāchārya who are to be found in almost every province of India. They accept Śaṅkara's interpretation of the Vedānta, recognize all the gods of the Hindu pantheon, and strictly adhere to the rules and regulations prescribed in the Smṛitis or Dharmaśāstras. The Advaita Sabhā of Kumbakonam was started in 1895 with a view to strengthen and defend the whole Smārta position. It organizes an annual assembly of the Brāhman Pandits of the school of Śaṅkarāchārya which usually meets at Kumbakonam. One of its great pillars, Professor Sundararaman, holds the view "that the whole of the ritualistic system of Hinduism comes from God, that every detail of it is right, that the punctilious observance of all its rules would bring health, strength and prosperity to the Indian people, and that the decline of India during the last two thousand years is the direct outcome of the neglect of these rules by large masses of the population." The following is a paragraph from one of his letters to the press:

"The consequences of rebellion against ritualistic Hinduism are writ plainly on the face of the history of India for two thousand years and more. Buddha began the first revolt, and since then he has had many successors and imitators. The unity and might of the once glorious fabric of Hindu society and civilization have been shattered, but not beyond hope of recovery. That recovery must be effected not by further doses of "Protestant" revolt, but by the persistent and patient endeavour to observe the injunctions and precepts of the ancient Dharma in its entirety".[69]

So this Professor of History looked upon the whole course of Indian history from an altogether different angle, and would fain replace Hinduism on its old pedestal by wiping off the traces of all changes introduced since the days of Buddha. This may be called Hindu revivalism *in excelsis*.

We now come to those religious movements which occupy an intermediate position between reform and revivalism. The only organized movement belonging to this category is the Ārya Samāj which has been discussed above. A few persons of less distinction than Svāmī Dayānanda also made an effort to reform Hinduism on similar lines without destroying its essential character.

Śivanārāyaṇ Paramahaṁsa, born about 1840 in Vārānasi, led the life of a wandering ascetic since the age of 12, and spent most of his time in Bengal during the last years of his life. His views were compiled in *Amṛita Sāgara* (1902) and also expounded in English in a book entitled *Indian Spirituality; or the Travel and Teachings of Sivanarayana*, written by one of his friends or devotees. He believed in one God, condemned idolatry and advocated social reforms, declaring woman to be equal with man. Though agreeing in these respects with Svāmī Dayānanda, he differed from him in two respects. He did not believe in the infallibility of the Vedas and laid no emphasis on the doctrine of *Karma* and transmigration. Following in the footsteps of Rāmakṛishṇa Paramahaṁsa he laid great stress on service to mankind. "Looking on all individuals as God and your own soul", so ran one of his teachings, "cherish them, so that want and suffering may come to none."[70] One of his suggestions seems to be very extraordinary. It may be quoted in his own words:

"Let all mankind have a common speech. Compile from all the scriptures of the world, in that common human tongue, a scripture, containing all that is useful for man to know concerning his spiritual and temporal welfare. Preserve that one and burn all the rest, burying their ashes out of sight".[71] Śivanārāyaṇ "expressly prohibited the formation of a sect. But there is a large number of men and women in Calcutta and other places, specially among the Mech tribe of Assam, who look upon him as a source of spiritual inspiration".[72] A member of this tribe, Kālicharan by name, became the leader of a small sect following the doctrine of Śivanārāyaṇ.

The teachings of Rāmakṛishṇa that all religions are true—all ways lead to salvation—found a concrete illustration in a movement called Sādhāran Dharma, started in Madras in 1886, the very year of Rāmakṛishṇa's death. It aimed "not to establish uniformity but unity in variety throughout the different cults and sects of India, and by and by of the whole world". Those who profess other faiths need not disclaim them when they adopt Sādhāran Dharma. Its fundamental principle was that God may be realized "by the development of one's moral or physical powers and the use of them for the good of humanity."[73]

The Rādhā Scāmi Satsang,[74] an esoteric sect, was founded in 1861 by one Tulsī Rām, a Kshatriya, better known as Śiva Dayāl Sāheb. He was a banker at Agra and had no Western education. The only means of salvation, according to him, was the practice of *Surat Śabd Yoga* (union of the human soul with the spirit-current or word) under the guidance of a Sant Satguru or sincere lover of the Supreme Being. Śiva Dayāl died in 1878 leaving his doctrine embodied in two books, each named *Sār Bachan* i.e. "Essential Utterance". The second *guru*, a retired Postmaster-General of U.P., was a Kāyastha of Agra, known as Rāi Sāligrām Sāheb Bāhādur. He was the head of the sect from 1878 to 1898 and organized the Satsang. It was his vigorous and orderly mind that systematized its teaching and gave it its modern character. The sect recognizes no god of the Hindu pantheon, nor any temples or sacred places except those sanctified by the presence of the *guru* or his relics. But most of the conceptions of the sect are Hindu and of these the majority are Vaishṇavite. God, the world, and the soul are recognized as realities; the spirit-current (*Śabda),* which streams from the Supreme and is the source of all things, corresponds to the Śakti of the Vaishṇava and Śaiva systems. The method of religious exercise is unknown, for it is imparted by the *guru* to the disciple under a vow of secrecy.

The third *guru* was a Bengali Brāhman named Brahmā Śaṅkar Miśra, an M. A. of the Calcutta University. He drew up for the Satsang a regular constitution and gave it a definite organization. He wrote two brief expositions of the faith and a book called *Discourses on Rādhāsoāmi Faith.* When he died in 1907 he left Satsang a powerful organization, within narrow geographical limits, and it was destined to achieve fame and distinction as a religious community-organization with a good many special features of its own.

The Deva Samāj[76] was founded by Śiva-nārāyaṇ Agnihotrī belonging to a Brāhmaṇa family of U.P. He was educated in the Engineering College at Rurki and was initiated with his wife by a member of the college in Śaṅkarāchārya's Vedānta philosophy. He next became an active member of the Brāhma Samāj at Lahore, and carried on a crusade against the Ārya Samāj. His domineering personality and autocratic temper led to friction with other leaders. So he seceded from the Brāhma Samāj, and on 16 February, 1887, founded the Deva Samāj. The doctrines of the Brāhma Samāj were adopted with the predominance of the *guru* as an additional element. He was practically regarded and worshipped as a god by his disciples who called him *Satyadeva,* 'real god'. The literature of the earlier period was withdrawn from circulation and the devotional meetings and the worship of the *guru* were held in private. The religious text of the Samāj was called *Deva Śāstra,* and the teaching, *Deva Dharma.* The *guru* claimed supernatural powers of all kinds.

The history of the religious movements will not be complete without a reference to the bands of ascetic saints who were objects of veneration over large parts of India. Many of these gathered round them a number of devoted followers, and though they did not establish a regular sect with a definite organization or constitution, they, or some of their principal followers, are still venerated as *guru* by large circles of householders, belonging chiefly to the educated middle class families. Special mention may be made of Bholāgiri, Trailaṅga Svāmī, Pāhārī Bābā, Bijoy-krishṇa Gosvāmī, Kāṭhiābābā, and his disciple Santadās Bābāji. Some of them were adherents of old sects.

It should also be mentioned that apart from the well-known branches of orthodox Hindus, Sikhs,and Jains, many of the old religious sects still wielded considerable influence among sections of people. These included, among others, the Kabīr-panthīs, Dādū-panthīs, Rādhāballabhis, Daṇḍīs and Daśanāmis, Yogis, Aghoris, Avadhūtas, Vāmāchārīs, Sauras, Gāṇapatyas, etc. A new Vāmāchārī sect, known as Kartābhajā, was founded in 1830 by Rāmśaran Pāl of Ghoshpārā in Bengal. Its principal features were faith in the absolute divinity of the *guru* as being an incarnation of Kṛishṇa and the Tāntrik ceremony of *'Chakra'* or the promiscuous gathering of male and female devotees indulging in licentious practices. There were numerous disciples belonging to all castes, most of whom were women.[76]

VIII. MUSLIM RELIGION AND SOCIETY.

The first half of the period from 1818 to 1905 was fraught with grave concern and anxiety for the Indian Muslims. The East India Company, stretching its tentacles wider and wider, swept away the last vestiges of the Muslim rule by annexing Sindh in 1843 and the kingdom of Awadh in 1856, and finally exiling the last of the Mughul emperors, Bahadur Shah II, from the Red Fort in Delhi to Rangoon. In the Panjāb Ranjit Singh had established a powerful kingdom which included a considerable portion of the North-West Frontier Province. The Deccan kingdom, no doubt, still survived, but it was reduced in extent and its ruler, the Nizam, was practically a subordinate ally of the British authority. The Muslims all over the country, therefore, found themselves in a hopelessly precarious condition, shorn virtually of all political power and a prey to manifold inimical forces which threatened their very existence as a separate religious community in a land which they had ruled for the last six centuries.

This sad state of affairs was naturally bound to have important and extensive repercussions on religion and society. The rapid decline of the Mughul empire and the loss of one territory after another had left the majority of the Muslims dazed and perplexed, but some of the more serious-minded among them had been striving, vainly perhaps, to discover the cause of this decline and to find out appropriate remedies to check it. Their thoughts had naturally turned to religious reforms, for, according to their diagnosis, the chief cause of the malaise that had seized the Muslims in India was the fact that they had drifted away from the teachings of Islam and had adopted ways and manners alien to its puritanic spirit,—a development which the spread of Sūfīstic ideas had, they believed, helped to a great extent. It was, therefore, necessary to purge the Indian Muslims' religious beliefs and social customs of all extraneous growths and to lead them back to the pristine purity of Islam. The most notable attempt in this direction was made as early as the 17th century by the so-called Mujaddid Alf-i-Sāni,[77] Sheikh Ahmad Sirhindi, in the days of Emperor Jahangir, when the Mughul empire was still at the zenith of its power, but the Muslim society had already become largely Hinduised, thanks mainly to the tolerant attitude of the Chishtiya Sūfī saints and the conciliatory policy of Emperor Akbar.

A similar attempt was made during the period under review by one of the most remarkable persons that the decadent Muslim society of India was able to produce, namely, Saiyid Ahmad of Rai-Bareilly, who was actively helped by a band of zealous and staunch followers, notably Shah Muhammad Ismā'īl known as the Shahīd (martyr)[78] and Maulana Abdul Hayy. Saiyid Ahmad, however, did not confine his activities to the field of social and religious reform but embarked on a military campaign to rid the Panjāb Muslims of Sikh domination. Detailed account has been given above[79] of his initial success and subsequent defeat and death at the battle of Balakot on 6 May, 1831. But one must not suppose that he and his followers had sacrificed their lives in vain. The emphatic gesture made by them had focussed the Indian Muslims' attention on their own debased and degenerate religious and social condition and had successfully roused in their hearts an ardent desire to improve it. They had perished, but the seed sown by them was to sprout and to grow into a vigorous tree in the years to come.[80]

It was not many years after the tragic end of Saiyid Ahmad's campaign, that the Indian Muslims had to face another catastrophe, greater, perhaps, than any other in their chequered history. The great outbreak of 1857, in which the Muslims had taken a very active part, resulted most disastrously for them; their forlorn hope of reviving the Mughul empire was cruelly shattered and they found themselves in a precariously weak economic condition which was sure to have a very demoralising effect on them. The victorious British made them the special target of their wantonly revengeful deeds of murder and rapine. Thousands of them were massacred in Delhi alone, while whole families had to quit their homes, leaving behind all their earthly possessions and seeking shelter in alien and not always very congenial surroundings. In Delhi, where before the outbreak practically all the house property had belonged to the Muslims, there now remained only a few of them who could still boast of having a roof of their own over their heads, and the conditions in most of the other important cities in Northern India were not much better. When it is remembered that the majority of the Muslim population of North-Western India in those days—as indeed it is even now—was concentrated in the cities, the extent of the disaster which this upheaval spelt for the Muslims can be easily imagined. The intense feeling of frustration and despondency that prevailed among them is reflected in the writings of most of the contemporary poets and thinkers such as Ghālib, Bahādur Shāh Zafar and Sir Syed Ahmad. The last, as a matter of fact, thought at one time of leaving India and migrating to some other country, because he could not bear the sight of so much misery and distress around him.

The reform movement initiated by Saiyid Ahmad Barelvi and his pupils gained fresh strength after the Mutiny and manifested itself in different garbs. There was, in the first place, a group of religious thinkers who had been visibly affected by the Wahābī[81] ideology, first preached by the great Arab scholar, Ibn Taimiya[82], and they now started preaching the new ideas and gaining new supporters. The majority of the Indian Muslims were still staunch adherents of the Hanafi school, with strong leanings towards Sūfīism, and consequently could not easily be won over to the soul-less, dry and rigidly puritanic Wahābī discipline. The net result, therefore, of the zealous preachings of this school of theology was to drive them more forcibly and in larger numbers into the Sūfī fold. It is thus that we find both the Chishtiya and the Naqshbandiya, the two main Sūfī *silsilas* in India, flourishng more than ever during this period and their teachings not infrequently degenerating into rank superstition and blind saint-worship in the hands of unscrupulous *pīrs,* which, in its turn, produced a strong reaction in the minds of the more sensible and thoughtful Muslims. The foundation of the Dār-al-'Ulūm at Deoband in A.D. 1866, which has continued to attract students not only from different parts of India but from the neighbouring Muslim countries also, was the greatest achievement of the Wahābī school of thought in India[83], whereas the Madrisa-i-Qadīma of Farangi Mahal established during the reign of Aurangzeb[84] continued to represent the old Hanafi school, maintaining a *via media* between the extreme and diametrically opposed Wahābī and Sūfī doctrines. A third important institution with a distinctly religious bias and with an ideology not very different from that which guided the scholars of the Farangi Mahal, was founded in 1898 by the famous scholar, Shibli Nu'māni, and others in Lakhnau. The Nadwat al-'Ulama, as the new institution was called, has, however, shown a more realistic and progressive outlook since its very inception, and has produced a number of distinguished scholars whose writings have profoundly affected the more religious-minded Muslims of India. It has successfully discarded from its curriculum the time-worn skeleton of the Darsi-Nizāmi[85], which, in the opinion of many enlightened educationists, has been responsible for stultifying the mental and intellectual outlook of the Indian Muslims and has been producing a type of scholars utterly unfit for the present-day requirements.

But while the religious and social reformers were busy all over the country, very little attention was paid to the fast-deteriorating economic condition of the Muslim masses. With the gradual decline and final extinction of the Mughul empire, they had been losing all the old privileges which they had so far enjoyed, while the anti-

Muslim policy of the new rulers of India and their own foolish prejudice against modern education had deprived them of all new opportunities of material progress and prosperity. The doors of Government employment were virtually closed to them, and their only other source of livelihood—landed property—was rapidly slipping out of their hands due to their own improvident ways of life. Religious fervour, such as the reformist movement inspired, or emotional ecstasy which the protagonists of the Sūfī cult promised, could not be a substitute for meat and bread, nor was poverty the surest means of attaining the higher spiritual ideals. Some idea of the low state of moral degeneration and economic depression to which they had sunk, can be had from Sir William Hunter's book, *The Indian Mussalmans,* written by him at the instance of Lord Mayo, then Viceroy of India, in the year 1871, which, though dealing primarily with the Muslims of Bengal, gives, nevertheless, a painfully realistic picture of the plight of the Muslims generally throughout India[86]. Something had, therefore, to be done immediately to stem this rot and to save them from the abysmal doom towards which they were heading. The crying need of the moment was to try to overcome the reluctance of the Indian Muslims to adapt themselves to their changed circumstances and at the same time to gain the confidence of the British rulers who had so far looked upon them with suspicion and distrust. This was by no means an easy task, but luckily for them, at this critical juncture, there appeared on the scene one of the greatest men—if not the greatest—that Muslim India has produced in recent times. The man was Sir Syed Ahmad Khan, who set upon this Herculean task with a wonderfully clear vision and an extraordinarily firm resolve, disdaining alike the open hostility of the conservative *ulema* and the veiled gibes of some of his own close friends and colleagues.

Born in Delhi in the year 1817, Sir Syed Ahmad Khan had inherited the best traditions of a culture which was developed in that city through the long centuries of Muslim rule in India. His paternal grandfather, Syed Hādī, and maternal grandfather, Khwaja Farīd, had both held high and responsible posts under the Mughul emperors and the East India Company, and he had received his early education under their direct supervision from some of the ablest scholars of the day. His family members, especially his father, Mīr Muttaqī, were spiritually attached to the Naqshbandiya school, the most prominent representative of which in Delhi in those days was Mir Ghulam Ali for whom Sir Syed Ahmad always cherished a tender and affectionate regard. He was, however, born with a restless and sceptic mind and could not reconcile himself to a blind belief in religious dogmas, handed down from one generation to another. He wanted to exercise, as some of the other daring individuals had done before his time, his own intelligence in understanding and interpreting those dogmas[87]. This is precisely why we find him appearing in the role of a religious reformer in his early social career after his retirement from service. His articles in the magazine, *Tahzib al-Akhlāq*, which he started in 1870 shortly after his return from England, as well as some of his other writings[88], gave evidence of a marked rationalistic and non-conformist trend of thought, which brought upon him the wrath of the orthodox divines who all too readily dubbed him a naturalist and a *kāfir*, an unbeliever or heretic, to be shunned by pious Muslims.

Sir Syed Ahmad Khan was not the man whom such condemnation could easily intimidate; but he was a wise man, too, and realized that he could make little headway in the field of religious reform against the bitter opposition of the commonly recognised custodians of the *sharī'at*, and so turned his attention mainly to social reform and specially to education, and it is now mostly as an educationist that his memory is revered by the Indian Muslims.

His first achievement in the educational field was the establishment of two *madrasas* of pre-eminently old type at Moradabad and Ghazipur, which were soon followed by the foundation of a school on modern lines at Aligarh, which made rapid progress under the able supervision of his friend, Maulavi Sami'ullah Khan. This school in the course of time developed into the Muhammadan Anglo-Oriental College[89] with the active help and encouragement of the British authorities whose attitude towards the Muslims had undergone a radical change by now, thanks mainly to Sir Syed Ahmad Khan's relentless efforts[90]. He was helped in his task by a band of devoted friends and followers, the most notable among whom were the two Nawabs, Muhsin'ul-Mulk and Vaqār'ul-Mulk, the well-known scholar, Dr. Nazir Ahmad, and the famous poet, Altāf Hussain Hāli[91], with whose active co-operation he was also enabled to lay the foundation of the Muhammadan Educational Conference[92] soon after the inception of the Indian National Congress.[93]

The yeoman's service which the M.A.O. College,—now a full-fledged University—rendered to the cause of the education and social advancement of the Indian Muslims cannot be over-estimated. It has produced some of the most eminent Muslim scholars of modern times and its alumni, distinguished by a peculiar intellectual outlook and cultural polish, have held responsible Government posts with marked success. It should not, however, be presumed that the foundation of this College was generally hailed by the Muslims. On the contrary, Sir Syed Ahmad Khan had to fight hard to make his new venture a success and to convince his critics of its utility. The opposition came not only from the more religious-minded Muslims who looked askance at the modernisation of education and Europeanisation of the Muslim society, such as the College was calculated to bring about, but, strangely enough, from a number of enlightened individuals, like Shiblī Nu'mānī and Akbar Allahabadi, who ought to have known better and to have behaved more sensibly. The main reasons for this opposition, however, were apparently not so much ideological as personal, and were, in any case, not weighty enough to appeal to the rank and file of the Muslim community which soon came to look upon the College as the most useful avenue of educational and economic progress open to them.

The progress of Muslim education in India was further helped by two other institutions of a quasi-modern type established by Government initiative, namely the Calcutta Madrasa and the Anglo-Arabic School (later College) of Delhi, both of which acquired considerable reputation as centres of learning and had the distinction of having on their staff able scholars like Dr. Nazir Ahmad, Shams-ul-Ulama Maulavi Zia-ud-din, and others.

In another part of India, the Panjāb, in the meantime, the Wahābī influence, to which we have referred above, was responsible for the emergence of two *"ghair-muqallid"* (non-conformist) schools of theology. These became known as Ahl-i-Hadīs (people of the apostolic tradition) and the Ahl-i-Qur'ān (people of the Qur'ān), because they regarded, respectively, the Hadīs of the Prophet (plus, of course, the Qur'ān) or the Qur'ān alone to be the final authority for the correct interpretation of Muslim rituals and dogmas, thus practically cutting themselves off from the four recognised schools of jurisprudence which came into being in the second century of the Hijra.[94] Nawab Siddiq Hasan of Bhopal and Syed Nazir Husain were the most prominent representatives of the first school in the latter half of the 19th century, while Maulvi Abdullah Chakralavi, after whom the Ahl-i-Qur'ān are often designated "Chakralvis", founded the second. Their influence, however, was not deep or widespread, and it is really difficult for a layman to understand in what material respects they differed from the parent Hanafi school from which they had chosen to secede.

The same remark is more or less true of another sect, also founded in the Panjāb, namely the Ahmadis or Qadianis, followers of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, born at Qadian, a small town in the Gurdaspur District, in 1837. Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, a good scholar of religious sciences as well as the Arabic and Persian languages, and gifted by nature with an eloquent tongue and a strong reasoning faculty, was evidently influenced by the rationalist movement pioneered in India by Sir Syed Ahmad Khan, Maulavi Charagh Ali (d. 1895) and others. He, too, was moved by an ardent desire to reform Islam and to present its beliefs and tenets in a logical and reasonable form in order to be able to defend them better against the onslaughts of the Christian missionaries, particularly of the Scotish Church, who were fairly active in those days, and the aggressive and militant Ārya-Samājists. As a champion of Islam against its critics and enemies, he acquired wide popularity among his co-religionists in his early career, and his work, the *Barāhīni-Ahmadiya,* published in 1880, was very well received by most of them. When, however, in 1891, he put forth the tall claim to be a prophet, the Mahdi and the promised Messiah, and even an incarnation of Kṛishṇa, they turned bitterly hostile to him, for according to the popular Muslim belief Muhammad is the last of the prophets and any one claiming prophet-hood after him is a fraud and a preposterous liar. He was, nevertheless, able to gain a number of adherents and carried on his mission through his writings and articles in an English journal, the *Review of Religions,* started from Qadian in 1892. He died at Lahore in 1908 and was buried at Qadian[95]. The Qadianis, while conforming in general to the orthodox Hanafi school and differing from it only in certain matters of belief, such as that of the immaculate conception of Christ and his ascension to heaven alive, the bodily ascension of the Prophet of Islam (on the night of the Mi'rāj), etc., yet consider themselves to be a separate religious group and regard all those who do not believe in their leader's prophet-hood to be unbelievers *(kāfirs).* The more moderate among them, however, do not, at least openly, share in this view, but are none the less regarded with suspicion and distrust by the orthodox Muslims. Whatever one may think of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad's claim, there can be no doubt that his preachings infused a fresh and vigorous religious spirit among the Muslims and that his followers have shown commendable missionary zeal, both in India and abroad, constituting, as they do, the most closely knit and perhaps the best organised Muslim religious group in the country.

Our review so far has only dealt with the Sunni School of theology and its various offshoots and ramifications. A large number of Muslims in India are Shi'as, who have often played a conspicuous part in their political, social and cultural life. Their belief in the divine character of the Imāms who consequently are the only accredited interpreters of the teachings of the Prophet, has exercised a restraining influence on their rank and file, and rebellious movements like the Bābi and the Bahā'i, originating in Iran, have not affected them materially. They, moreover, do not consider the door of *ijtihād*[96] to have been closed for all times, as do the majority of the Sunni Muslims, and their faith in their *dā'is*[97] and *mujtahids*[98] who can look after their spiritual and material welfare under changing circumstances has deprived them of any serious urge for religious reform, or secession from the parent body. Their religious life has, therefore, pursued an even and smooth course, unruffled by the disturbances which have been agitating the majority Sunni group. They, however, have not been oblivious of their educational progress and social uplift, and during the period under survey they founded or reorganized a number of schools and colleges for the special benefit of their community, the most notable among which are the Shi'a Arabic College, the Nāzimiya College and the Sultan al-Madāris in Lakhnau (Lucknow), and the Madrasa-i-Jawādiya in Banaras. A missionary organization, called the Imamiya Mission, which is associated with the Nāzimiya College, has also shown considerable activity in India and elsewhere during the last few decades.

Another remarkable development of the period, which though primarily of literary import is yet of a very considerable social significance, was the emergence of Urdu as a literary language. This language, born in military camps from the Hindī Khaṛī Bolī during the later Mughul period and subsequently finding a fertile soil in Lakhnau, had already been used extensively by the Indian poets of Northern India and the Deccan, but it was really in this period that it developed into a medium of expression for religious, philosophic and scientific thoughts. An Urdu translation of the Qur'ān was made as early as 1791 by Shah Abdu'l Qadir, but the credit for developing a simple, chaste and refined prose style goes to the writers of this period. The most distinguished of these were Ghālib[99], Sir Syed Ahmad Khan[100], Hālī[101], Dr. Nazīr Ahmad[102],, Maulavi Zaka'ullāh[103] and Maulavi Mohammad Husain Āzād of Delhi[104]. Urdu now also became the common vehicle of conversation and written communication, replacing Persian which had so far been the popular language of the educated classes. The two earliest Urdu works of fiction, namely, the Urdu version of the *Bāgh-o-Bahār,* entitled the *Qissa-i-Chahār Durwesh* and the *Fasāna-i-Ajā'ib*[105] were also written during this period by Mir Amman of Delhi and Rajab Ali Surūr of Lakhnau, respectively, while a beginning in Urdu journalism on modern lines was likewise made towards the end of the 19th century. Among the earliest magazines deserving special mention was the *Oudh Punch*[106] of Lakhnau, a humorous weekly modelled on the pattern of the London *Punch,* and the *Makhzin* of Lahore, a literary monthly of very considerable merit.[107]

A marked feature of this period was the rapid modernisation of the educated classes in which Sir Syed Ahmad Khan and the M.A.O. College, Aligarh, played an important role. Sir Syed Ahmad Khan, who visited England in 1869, was greatly impressed by the regulated and disciplined life of the Europeans and did his best to popularise European dress and manners among his co-religionists generally, and the Aligarh students particularly. It was with this end in view that he founded the English House, a hostel meant for boys of well-to-do families run on European lines with a European lady superintendent in charge. The uniform prescribed for the college students was also a sort of compromise between the eastern and western modes of dress—white trousers of the English pattern, a buttoned-up black coat, and the red Turkish cap or fez, the last being symbolic of the Indian Muslims' sympathy with the Turks which received a great fillip during the Crimean and Greco-Turkish wars. The use of tables and chairs now became a common practice in enlightened Muslim households and English food served in China dishes and plates was no longer a rare phenomenon.

But while the male section of the Muslim urban society was fast taking to these modern ways, the women, generally speaking, remained more conservative and had very few opportunities of getting English education. It was only in a few of the more enlightened and emancipated families that they were permitted to receive lessons in English in their own homes from European missionary ladies. Strict purdah was still the general rule, and a respectable woman could never dare to go out without a veil and unescorted by a male chaperon. Fortunately for women, however, the practice of polygamy, a very common feature of the Muslim society in the preceding centuries, registered a marked decline, thanks mainly to the prevalence of modern ideas and the decline in material prosperity. Some of the more daring among them actually took up the cudgels against their menfolk in the matter, and gave vent openly to their natural resentment against the practice. They were, nevertheless, hampered in their task by the lack of an appropriate and convenient forum for the expression of their views, but succeeded towards the end of this period in starting magazines of their own, among which the weekly *Tāhzīb-i-Niswān* of Lahore was the earliest and the most conspicuous.[108] The Begum of Bhopal, Sultan Jahān Begum, was among the chief patrons of the new progressive movement. The women, however, still remained essentially eastern in their general outlook of life. their selfless devotion to their husbands and children and their strict observance of religious rites and ceremonies. It was, indeed, chiefly due to them that a preponderantly religious atmosphere continued to be a noticeable characteristic of a Muslim home, when many of their men-folk had already become alienated from religion. In the matter of dress also they remained very conservative, only a few of them adopting the European styles in the privacy of their homes. European, mostly English, governesses and companions were, however, not uncommon in the households of the wealthier people, especially those who had had an opportunity of going abroad. The age-old dictum of a woman's right place being her home still ruled supreme, and a Muslim woman could not yet dream of partaking in a mixed gathering of males and females or playing any active role in the social and cultural activities of the males. Marriages, betrothals, the *bismillāh,*[109] *'aqīqa*[110] and circumcision ceremonies, accompanied by a lot of feasting and merry-making, which were quite frequent under the joint family system still prevalent on a large scale, provided them with enough amusement and excitement and helped considerably in relieving the monotony of their otherwise drab and confined lives. Although deprived of the benefits of modern education,[111] many of them, specially of the middle class, were good scholars in Arabic and Persian, and possessed a refined taste for Urdu poetry. Widow re-marriage, which had been strictly taboo among the respectable middle classes, due obviously to Hindu influence, now became quite common, thanks to the reformative efforts of Syed Ahmad Barelvi and his pupils, and the custom of denying to the daughters—against the clear mandate of Islam—a share in the property of their fathers, which was prevalent in some parts of the country, became gradually obsolete. On the whole, therefore, the 19th century may be said to have witnessed an improvement in the social status of the Muslim women in India, which has helped to pave the way for a complete emancipation, social and economic, which is yet in the offing.

To conclude this brief review, we may say that the period from 1818 to 1905 was a really critical one in the history of the Indian Muslims. It was, on the one hand, a period of frustration and despondency, of political decline and social demoralisation, and finally one of economic deterioration. But, on the other hand, it was also a period of religious revival, of educational progress, and of a growing awareness among them of the debased position to which they had been gradually reduced in this country as, indeed, in most of the other countries which they had once ruled. The great political upheavals of this period thus helped in bringing about a renaissance of Indian Islam and a re-orientation of the Muslim society in keeping with the changed circumstances in which it was now placed. so that in the words of the great poet, Iqbal:

Mulk hāthon se gayā, millat ki ānkhen khul gain, *Surma chashmi-dasht men gard-i-ram-i-āhū.*

(Sovereignty passed out of its hands, but the eyes of the Muslim community were opened. The dust raised by the flight of the gazelle became antimony for the desert's eye.)

IX. CHRISTIANITY.

The Protestant Christian nations of Europe who came to India in the seventeenth century differed in one respect from the Catholic Portuguese who came a century earlier. Unlike the latter they had no proselytising mission, and the English East India Company were prohibited by a clause in their charter from sending out missionaries to India.

It was neither the powerful English nor the Dutch, but the Danes who sent the first Protestant mission to India,—to Tranquebar, an insignificant locality which they possessed in India. Zeigenbalg, the first missionary who reached India in 1706, candidly confessed that his mission had little success. He pointed out that the Christians in India were "so much debauched in their manners", and "so given to gluttony, drunkenness, lewdness, cursing, swearing, cheating and cozening" and "proud and insulting in their conduct", that many Indians, judging the religion by its effect upon its followers, "could not be induced to embrace Christianity". Only a few poor or destitute persons were converted, and they had to be fed and maintained by the mission. When Ziegenbalg wanted to convert the upper classes by argument, he failed miserably. "In a notable debate held under the auspices of the Dutch in Negapatam, Ziegenbalg disputed with a Brahmin for five hours, and far from converting the Brahmin, the missionary came away with an excessive admiration for the intellectual gifts of his adversary".[112]

Zeigenbalg's missionary effort was typical of Christian missionary enterprise in India during the eighteenth century. No doubt the number of converts steadily increased and churches were founded in different parts of India. But it was the remittance from Europe that supplied the cost of building churches and feeding the congregation. Abbe Dubois (1,765-1848) published, at the end of the eighteenth or beginning of the nineteenth century, his *Letters on the State of Christianity in India*. In these he "asserted his opinion that under existing circumstances there was no human possibility of so overcoming the invincible barrier of Brahminical prejudice as to convert the Hindus as a nation to any sect of Christianity. He acknowledged that low castes and outcastes might be converted in large numbers, but of the higher castes he wrote: 'Should the intercourse between individuals of both nations, by becoming more intimate and more friendly, produce a change in the religion and usages of the country, it will not be to turn Christians that they will forsake their own religion, but rather...to become mere atheists."[112a]

The history of the Christian mission in the 19th century in Bengal begins with William Carey, a cobbler in an insignificant village in Northamptonshire, who embarked upon an Evangelical mission and came to Calcutta in 1793. He earned some money by working as the manager of an Indigo factory in the Maldah District, and then set up his own factory at Kidderpore near Calcutta. At his invitation four missionaries came from England to join him, but as the authorities refused them permission to land they went to the Danish settlement of Serampore, about 15 miles from Calcutta. Lord Wellesley, the Governor-General, demanded the "surrender of the fugitives in order to deport them to England", but the Danish Governor refused and the matter was not pursued any further. Carey also migrated to Serampore and joined the four; and with the help of William Ward and Joshua Marshman—the other two having shortly died—built up the famous Serampore Mission whose reputation was not confined to Bengal but spread to other parts of India. "Carey laboured in India for seven years without making a single convert", but he did splendid work in promoting education and improving vernaculars in different parts of India.[113]

Early in the nineteenth century there grew up an agitation in England in support of sending Evangelical mission to India. Many thought it preposterous that "when non-Christian rulers in Asia often gave the missionary permission to preach the gospel in their kingdoms, the Christian British should deny this elementary human right to the missionary".[114] But apart from the legal restriction, the Englishmen in India, whose easy voluptuous life was the main target of missionary attack, regarded as obnoxious not only preaching but even the very presence of the missionary in India".[115] One Mr. Twining, a tea-dealer, wrote to the Chairman of the East India Company:

"As long as we continue to govern India in the mild, tolerant spirit of Christianity, we may govern it with ease; but if ever the fatal day should arrive, when religious innovation shall set her foot in that country, indignation will spread from one end of Hindustan to the other, and the arms of fifty millions of people will drive us from that portion of the globe, with as much ease as the sand of the desert is scattered by the wind".[116] This letter stirred up a hornet's nest and there emerged two distinct schools of public opinion.

Their controversy raged with unabated fury and "the climax was reached in 1813 when the question of renewing the Charter of the East India Company came up before the Parliament. The missionaries valiantly fought for the deletion of the obnoxious clause and substitution of a new one giving full permission to Evangelists of all denominations to preach the Gospel wherever they pleased in the Company's dominions".[117] Mr. Marsh, an able lawyer, who spent several years in Madras, put the case on the other side in the following words:

> "Indeed, when I turn my eyes either to the present condition or ancient grandeur of that country; when I contemplate the magnificence of her structures, her spacious reservoirs, constructed at an immense expense, pouring fertility and plenty over the land, the monuments of a benevolence expanding its cares over remote ages; when I survey the solid and embellished architecture of her temples, the elaborate and exquisite skill of her manufactures and fabrics, her literature sacred and profane, her gaudy and enamelled pottery[117a] on which a wild and prodigal fancy has lavished all its opulence; when I turn to the philosophers, lawyers and moralists who have left the oracles of political and ethical wisdom to restrain the passions and to awe the vices which disturb the commonwealth; when I look at the peaceful and harmonious alliances of families, guarded and secured by the household virtues; when I see amongst a cheerful and well-ordered society, the benignant and softening influence of religion and morality, a system of manners founded on a mild and polished obeisance, and preserving the surface of social life smooth and unruffled—I cannot hear without surprise, mingled with horror, of sending out Baptists and Anabaptists to civilize or convert such a people at the hazard of disturbing or deforming institutions which appear to have hitherto been the means ordained by Providence of making them virtuous and happy".[118]

Montgomery, who had lived long in India, supported the same policy, though from another point of view. "He declared that Christianity had nothing to teach Hinduism, and no missionary ever made a really good Christian convert in India. He, too, like the tea-dealer, had a sound respect for the martial powers of the Indians, and concluded that he "was more anxious to save the 30,000 of his countrymen in India than to save the souls of all the Hindus by making them Christians at so dreadful a price".[119]

A number of people, including Wilberforce, sought to refute these arguments by painting in black colours the horrible customs of the Hindus such as the *Sati*, infanticide, throwing of children into the Gaṅgā, religious suicide, and above all, idolatry. Vivid descriptions were given of the massacre of the innocents resulting from the car procession of Lord Jagannath at Puri, and the Baptists put down the number of annual victims at not less than 120,000. "When challenged they had to admit that they did not actually count the dead bodies but arrived at the figure by an ingenious calculation."[120]

In any event, the missionaries won the battle and the new Charter of 1813 not only granted them right to visit India but also gave them full liberty to preach their religion there. A Bishop, with headquarters at Calcutta, was appointed with jurisdiction over whole of the dominions of East India Company. The consequence was a heavy influx of missionaries into India both from England and America. They first directed their attention to the East India Company and asked them to give up such practices as might be construed as indirect sympathy or support to heathen practices. In particular they took umbrage at the management of the temples by Company's Government, a task which they had taken over from their Hindu predecessors and was described by the missionaries as "the office of dry nurse to Vishnu". The other objections would be apparent from the memorial submitted to the Government of Bombay in 1839, pointing out the following anti-Christian practices, among others.

1. The employment of Brahmins and others for the purpose of making heathen invocations for rain and fair weather.
2. The inscription of 'Sri' on public documents, and the dedication of Government records to Ganesh and other gods.
3. The entertainment in courts of justice of questions of a purely idolatrous nature with no civil rights involved.
4. The degradation of certain castes by excluding them from particular offices and benefits not connected with religion.
5. The attendance of Government servants, civil and military, in their official capacity at Hindu and Muslim festivals with a view to participate in their rites and ceremonies or in the joining of troops and the use of regimental bands in the processions of Hindu and Muslim festivals or their attendance in any other capacity than that of police for the preservation of peace.
6. The firing of salutes by the troops or by vessels of the Indian Navy, in intimation and honour of Hindu festivals.[121]

As a result of such petitions and continued agitation in England the Court of Directors ordered "complete severance of Government connection from the religious activities of their subjects". "The salute to the gods was stopped; pilgrim taxes were abolished; the superintendence of religious festivals by the officials of the Company ceased and their function was confined to policing of the vast gatherings; temple lands were made over to Trusts and the Trustees were either elected by the congregation or nominated by British authorities from among respectable Hindus".[122]

The pendulum now swung to the opposite extreme. "The severance of the Company's connection from Hinduism appears to have been followed by an active campaign by the servants of the Company to Christianize India, and an interference with Hinduism was reported. For in a despatch of the Court of Directors we find that strict instructions were issued to the Governor-General to impress upon the servants of the Company the need for neutrality and non-interference."[123] But though the Government carried out the instructions and did not actively support the missionaries, the latter continued to derive strength and support in an indirect way. This was explained by Raja Rāmmohan Roy and Sir Syed Ahmed, as noted above.[124] Reference has also been made to overzealous officers who regarded proselytism as a part of their duty as pious Christians.[125]

Apart from the prestige and power which the missionaries enjoyed as members of the ruling race, particularly among the ignorant masses, several causes combined to impart success to their efforts. The first and most important cause was the spread of the knowledge of English. Educated Indians who were impressed by the Bible and Christian literature and repulsed by the superstitious practices in their own society, embraced Christianity, and their example was followed by less discriminating men. This accounts for a number of converts in the second quarter of the nineteenth century from among high class Hindus, such as Madhusudan Datta and K. M. Banerji.

But the conversion of this class gradually dwindled with the rise of the reforming sects like Brāhma Samāj, Ārya Samāj and others mentioned above, and by the end of the 19th century new converts of this class were almost negligible.

The English schools opened by the missionaries were mostly intended as instruments of conversion, but here, too, the success, very limited even at the beginning, gradually became less and less. Serious charges were made against the missionaries for making such conversions by force or fraud and it led to great commotions. A few such instances in Bengal were reported in a Calcutta paper on 6 July, 1833.[126] As a further illustration reference may be made to the conversion of a few well-to-do Parsi young men in Bombay. In Bombay "educational activities were taken in hand by the missionaries and where years of street preaching yielded nothing, the English schools began to show astounding results".[127] "The earliest converts were some well-to-do Parsi young men and their baptism caused a sensation in the city, the whole community rising against the missionaries. The neophytes were persecuted, the case was taken to law courts, and the whole city had to be guarded against riots..."[128]

The most disconcerting feature of the activities of Christian missionaries in India was the rabid tone of their criticism—rather abuse—of Hinduism. Even Reverend Alexander Duff, an eminent missionary who lived in India from 1830 to 1863 and had done so much for promoting education and social reforms, lost all balance while assailing Hinduism. The following extract from his book *India and Indian Missions* gives us a fair specimen of missionary mentality:

"Of all the systems of false religion ever fabricated by the perverse ingenuity of fallen man, Hinduism is surely the most stupendous...Of all systems of false religion it is that which seems to embody the largest amount and variety of semblances and counterfeits of divinely revealed facts and doctrines".

The *Tattvabodhinī Patrikā,* the organ of the Brāhma Samāj, criticised Duff's book in the most scathing terms. The conversion of a student of the Duff School and his wife to Christianity created a great commotion in Calcutta, and the orthodox Hindus rallied round Devendra-nāth Tagore who had launched a vigorous campaign against such forcible conversion. These efforts of the Indians were successful to a large extent and considerably reduced the number of conversions to Christianity. An indirect result of this anti-conversion campaign was the establishment of English schools by the Indians in order to draw away students from the missionary schools. Thus, as a result of the campaign mentioned above, a school was established in 1845, providing free instruction to about one thousand Hindu students.

But this subject need not be pursued any further. For the converts to Christianity from educated classes were a miscroscopic minority, perhaps less than one per cent. of the total during the whole of the 19th century. The greatest success of the missionaries was among the primitive tribes and the lowest classes among the Hindus—the depressed classes and untouchables. Religion always sat lightly upon the former and the prospects of material and social advance counted for much among them all. It should not be taken as disrespect or disparagement to Christianity if truth has to be told, namely, that by far the greatest number of those who swelled the rank of converts to Christianity was attracted less by the teachings of Jesus Christ and more by the prospect of improving their social status and the lure of bettering material prospects.

These included, besides free food and clothing in many cases, the facilities of schools, hospitals, maternity homes and other amenities of life which the missionaries were in a position to hold out before them,—thanks to the constant flow of money and men from Europe and America, and the zeal and ability of a band of hard-working and selfless missionaries to run these institutions. In many cases they were models which Indians looked upon with envy and despair.

---

1. The date of Rāmmohan's birth is not definitely known. The date, given on his tomb, is 1774, and there seems to be no adequate reason to disbelieve it. Miss Sophia Dobson Collet, in her *Life and Letters of Raja Rammohun Roy,* gives the date as 1772, on grounds which do not carry conviction. The biography of Rāmmohan, sponsored by the Committee which celebrated the Centenary of his death in 1933 and written by an eminent leader of the Brāhma Samāj, has accepted the date 1772. Arguments in its favour are given in p. 28 of this book. For the other view cf. *Rāmmohan Rāy* (in Bengali) by B. N. Banerji, p. 12 f.n.
2. This account of Rāmmohan's early life is based on the Centenary Biography referred to in the preceding note, to be henceforth referred to as "*Rammohun.*" But almost every single fact contained in it is doubtful. In particular there are no good grounds to believe (1) that Rāmmohan studied Persian and Arabic at Patna and Sanskrit at Banaras, at least for a long time—ten years according to Adam; (2) that he wrote a book against idolatry at the age of 16 or 17 or even imbibed such ideas at that early age, and consequently (3) that he was driven away by his father from home. His visit to Tibet is very unlikely, for he never refers to it in his own biographical sketches, though he mentions that he travelled in distant lands.
3. *Rammohun*, p. 10.
4. There is no foundation for the general belief that Rāmmohan was in the employ of the East India Company for a long time, from 1805 to 1814. Cf. B. N. Banerji, op. cit. 29-31.
5. *Rammohun*, 11.
6. According to some Rāmmohan settled in Calcutta in 1815, and not in 1814, which is the generally accepted view.
7. *Rammohun*, 13.
8. This biographical sketch was published in the *Athenaeum* of London, on 5 October, 1833 (pp. 666-68), i.e. about a week after the death of Rāmmohan, by Sandford Arnot. He says that "the Rajah gave this brief sketch of his life shortly before he proceeded to France in the autumn of last year (1832)." Dr. Carpenter, who was a very intimate friend of Rāmmohan in London, also wrote an account of his life in 1833. But there are some discrepancies between the two accounts. Miss Collet (see f. n. 1) has referred to the autobiographical sketch as "spurious autobiographical letter published by Sandford Arnot". Mr. B. N. Banerji (op. cit. 42-4) has shown that the statement in the autobiographical sketch that Rāmmohan wrote a book against idolatry at the age of sixteen cannot be reconciled with his own statement in other books. For the autobiographical sketch, cf. *Rammohun*, pp. 119-21. It is written in the form of a letter to a dear friend.
9. *Rammohun*, 15.
10. Ibid, 17-8.

10a. The Brāhma Samāj was the original name though it was also known as the Brahma Sabhā, and not vice versa, as is generally supposed. Cf. S. D. Collet, *The Life and Letters of Raja Rammohun Roy,* Edited by D.K. Biswas and P.C. Ganguli, pp. 239 ff.

11. Sastri, Sivanath, *History of the Brahmo Samaj*, 44.
12. Ibid, 72.
13. Ibid, 88-9.
14. Ibid, 99.

14a. Ibid.

15. Bhudev Mukhopadhyaya, *Bāṅglār Itihās* (in Bengali), Vol. III, p. 133.
16. Sastri, op. cit., 152.
17. B.C. Pal, *Memoirs of My Life and Times*, II, p. xv.

18. Ibid, xii.
19. Ibid, xiii.
19a. Widow remarriage has since become more popular and polygamy was prohibited by Act XXV of 1955.
20. Zacharias, 22.
21. Farquhar, J. N., *Modern Religious Movements in India*, p. 78.
22. Ranade, *Essays*, p. 250.
23. Fraquhar, op. cit., 79.
24. Ibid.
25. Ibid, 77.
26. The account that follows is chiefly based on Lajpat Rai, *Arya Samaj*.
27. B.C. Pal, op. cit., II. xxxiv.
28. Lajpat Rai, op. cit., 103.
29. B.C. Pal, op. cit., II. 77-8.
30. Ibid, xxxvi.
31. Lajpat Rai, op. cit., 74.
32. B.C. Pal, op. cit., xxxvi-xl.
33. Ibid, I, 437-8.
34. Ibid, 438-9.
35. Ibid, 439.
36. Ibid, 428.
37. This account is principally based on the Bengali biography of Rāmakṛishṇa Paramahaṁsa by Swāmī Sāradānanda.
38. Max Müller, *Rāmakṛishṇa, His Life and Sayings*, 59.
39. Ibid, 58.
39a. Ibid.
40. Ibid, 179.
41. Ibid.
42. Swāmī Gambhīrānanda, *History of the Ramakrishna Math and Mission*, p. 30.
43. Max Müller, op. cit. 100.
44. Gambhīrānanda, op. cit., 22-3.
45. Ibid, 24-5.
46. Ibid, 27-8.
47. Ibid, 37-8.
48. Ibid, 56.
49. Ibid, 70.
50. Ibid, 102.
50a. Ibid.
51. Ibid, 109-10.
52. Ibid, 109.
53. Ibid, 110.
53a. Dr. Bhupendranath Datta, *Swami Vivekananda Patriot-Prophet*, pp. 13, 330.
54. *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (11th Edition), Vol. IV, p. 48, s.v. 'Blavatsky, Helena Petrovna'.
55. Ibid, XXVI, 789-90, s. v. 'Theosophy'.
56. B.C. Pal, op. cit., II. lii-liii.
57. Ibid, liii.
58. *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, s. v. Blavatsky.
59. Annie Besant, *An Autobiography*, 345-6.
60. *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, s. v. Blavatsky.
61. Farquhar, op. cit., 84-5.
62. Ibid, 85.
63. Ibid, 292.
64. Ibid, 297.
65. Ibid, 296.
66. Ibid, 299.
67. Ibid, 302.
68. Ibid, 304.
69. Ibid, 307.
70. Ibid, 133.
71. Ibid.
72. Ibid, 131.
73. Ibid, 135.
74. Ibid, 157 ff.
75. Ibid, 173 ff.
76. Wilson, *Religious Sects of the Hindus*.
77. It means the Reformer of the 2nd millennium of the Hijri era. He was the most

redoubtable champion of the Naqsbandi order founded in India by Khwaja Baqi Billah.

78. He travelled all over the country, visiting one place after another, trying to mend the ways of his co-religionists and infuse in them the spirit—which they lacked so sadly in those days—to face boldly the difficulties which surrounded them. Included in his itinerary was Calcutta which he visited in 1820.
79. See above, Vol. IX, p. 887.
80. His teachings are embodied in his work *Sirāt-i-Mustaqim* (the Straight Path) edited by his pupils after his death. For a detailed account cf. Vol. IX, pp. 883 ff.
81. Followers of Muhammad b. ʻAbdu'l Wahāb of Najd who himself was profoundly affected by Ibn Taimiya's teaching.
82. Died 1328. He preached against saint worship and all unorthodox practices. Ironically enough, however, his own tomb became a place of pilgrimage in the course of time.
83. The Deobandis have never officially seceded from the Hanafī school, but there can be little doubt that they have strong leanings towards the Wahābīs with whom they agree in most matters of ritual and ceremony.
84. By Mulla Qutbuddin Suhālawi (d. 1691).
85. Formulated by Mulla Nizamuddin, son of Mulla Qutbuddin, the course was based on the study of Arabic grammar, logic, philosophy, mathematics, rhetorics, jurisprudence, dogmatic theology (*Kalām*), Quranic exegeses (*tafsir*) and Apostolic traditions (*hadis*). For a bitterly critical appraisal of the course, see Aslam Jairajpuri's *Maqalāt-i-Aslam*. See also *Rūd-i-Kauthar* pp. 405-410.
86. A graphic account of their plight is also contained in the famous Musaddas of Hāli (see below) and *Mauj-i-Kauthar* pp. 57 ff.
87. The earliest attempt to reconcile religion and philosophy and to interpret the Islamic dogmas rationally was made by the Muʻtazila in the days of al-Māmūn, the 6th Abbāsid Caliph.
88. These include the *Khutbāt-i-Ahmadiya* and an incomplete commentary of the Qur'ān.
89. Inaugurated by Lord Lytton on the 8th of January, 1877. The School was inaugurated by Sir William Muir in 1875.
90. See Vol. X, Ch. XLVI.
91. Hāli's contribution to the social renaissance of the Indian Muslims about this time cannot be too highly praised. His famous poem, the Musaddas, particularly achieved a publicity scarcely ever vouchsafed to any other single Urdu poem.
92. In 1886. It was in the Second Annual Session of the Conference that Sir Syed Ahmad delivered a vehement speech opposing the Congress ideals.
93. For his attitude towards the Congress cf. Ch. XV.
94. The Hanafī, founded by Abu Hanifa (d. 767), the Shafʻī, founded by al-Shāfiʻ (d. 820), the Malikī, founded by Malik ibn Anas (d. 795), and the Hanbalī, founded by Ahmad bin Hanbal (d. 855).
95. On his death, he was succeeded by one of his close associates, Nuruddin, but a split occurred after the latter's death in 1912, and his followers became divided into two groups, that of Qadian led by his son Mirza Bashiruddin Mahmud, continuing to believe in his prophet-hood, and the other with its centre at Lahore, led by Khwaja Kamaluddin and Maulavi Mohammad Ali, recognising him only as a reformer.
96. Exercise of personal judgment in legal matters.
97. Agents (lit. Callers") of the Imams, among the Ismāʻili Shiʻas.
98. Persons who have obtained an authority from the divines of Iraq to exercise personal judgment in legal matters.
99. In his letters, collections of which have been published by several scholars including the late Pandit Mahesh Prasad of the Banaras University.
100. In his *Mazāmīn* (essays), *Āsār al-Sanādīd*, etc.
101. In his *Muqaddama-i-Shiʻr-o-Shāʻiri* and *Yadgār-i-Ghālib*.
102. In his lectures and a number of moral, reformative novels.
103. In his voluminous histroy of India and essays.
104. His two works, the *Darbār-i-Akbarī* and the *Āb-i-Hayāt*, are real masterpieces of Urdu prose.
105. The first translation of the *Bāgh-o-Bahār*, entitled *Nau Tarz-Murassaʻ* was made actually by Muhammad Husain Tahsin in 1780, while Mir Amman's translation appeared in 1901. The *Fasāna-i-ʻAjāʼib* was written in 1824.
106. Curiously enough the *Oudh Punch* was in the forefront in waging war

against Sir Syed Ahmad Khan and his educational ventures, and it was through its columns that Akbar Allahabadi used to ridicule the M.A.O. College and the Muhammadan Educational Conference (See *Mauj-i-Kauthar* pp. 240-56).

107. We have already referred to the *Tahzib'al-Akhlāq* started by Sir Syed Ahmad. According to Muhammad Husain Azad, the first Urdu newspaper was started by his father in Delhi in 1836. (*Āb-i-Hayāt*, p. 37). For Urdu cf. pp. 214-5.

108. That even this step towards social emancipation was not approved ungrudgingly by the educated males is illustrated by Iqbal's bitter tirade against the progressive women in his *Zawāb-i-Shikwa*, in which he says:
Shauqi-tahrir-i-mazāmin men ghuli jāti hai
Parde men baith ke be parda hüi jāti hai.
"She (the Muslim woman) is consumed with the desire of contributing articles (to journals and magazines) thus discarding the purdah when still sitting behind it."

109. The first lesson given to a child by a maulavi, consisting in the repetition by the child of a Qur'ānic verse recited by him.

110. An Arabic word, meaning the natal hair of a child, used in India in the sense of the ceremonious removal of such hair.

111. The first school for girls on modern lines was founded by Shaikh 'Abdullah of Aligarh in 1906, but a beginning had been made in that direction earlier by opening a special section for women in the Muhammadan Educational Conference in 1903.

112. Thomas, P., *Christians and Christianity in India and Pakistan*, p. 153-54.
112a. *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 11th Edition, VIII. 624.
113. Thomas, op.cit., 165-6. Cf. pp. 167 ff., 184.
114. Ibid, 177.
115. Ibid.
116. Ibid, 178.
117. Ibid.
117a. The original has 'poetry.'
118. Thomas, op.cit., 179-80.
119. Ibid, 179.
120. Ibid, 180.
121. Ibid, 182.
122. Ibid, 183.
123. Ibid, 185.
124. See above, pp. 15-16; Vol. IX, pp. 419-20.
125. Cf. Vol. IX, pp. 419-20, 629.
126. Banerji, B. N., II. 172-174.
127. Thomas, op. cit., 191.
128. Ibid.

CHAPTER V (XLIII)

LITERATURE

I. INTRODUCTION

1. *Languages.*

Referring to the popular notion about wide diversity of languages in India Dr. S. K. Chatterji, the eminent Indian philologist, has observed: "The meticulous and all-inclusive classification of the languages and dialects current in India and Burma (which, until 1937, was politically a part of India), as given in the *Linguistic Survey of India,* shows a total number of 179 languages and 544 dialects. These figures are staggering indeed for any single country or State claiming to be a nation, but they are to be taken with some caution and reservation. For instance, of the above numbers, 116 are small tribal speeches which mostly belong to Burma. Then, again, the consideration of dialects is irrelevant when we mention the languages to which they belong, for it is the great literary languages that really matter". Dr. Chatterji then points out "that India has only the following fifteen great literary languages: (1) Hindi and (2) Urdu, which are but two styles of the same Hindustani speech, employing two totally different scripts and borrowing words from two different sources, (3) Bengali, (4) Assamese, (5) Oriya, (6) Marathi, (7) Gujarati, (8) Sindhi, (9) Panjabi, (10) Kashmiri, (11) Nepali, (12) Telugu, (13) Kannada, (14) Tamil, and (15) Malayalam. The various aboriginal speeches current in the jungles and hills of the Himalayas, and of eastern, central, and southern India, like Newari, Khasi, Garo, Gond, Santali, Maler, Kota, Toda, etc., as well as those wide-spread and partially cultivated languages, in some cases spoken by millions, like Maithili, Chattisgarhi, Brajabhakha, Marwari, etc., all find in one or the other of the above fifteen their accepted literary form. Fifteen languages for a population of about 437 millions (1951) is not a proposition that should frighten anyone".[1]

These languages fall under two groups.—Indo-Aryan and Dravidian, spoken respectively by 73 and 20 per cent. of the total population of India (including Pakistan).

In addition to the above there were three other literary languages current in India, namely, Sanskrit, Arabic, and Persian. None of these was a spoken language and inspired a great literature in the nineteenth century India. The last remark is also true of the English language, though it was the one and only spoken language understood throughout India in the nineteenth century. Although the use of these four languages in literature, properly so called, in the nineteenth century India, was very limited, each of them possesses special importance.

'The primary importance of Sanskrit lies in not only maintaining but also strengthening Indian cultural and political unity'." Sanskrit has been, and still continues to be, the one great unifying factor for the people of India. India is a multi-racial and polyglot country, and in spite of a basic Indianism which embraces all, there is a bewildering diversity (though in non-essentials) in the spiritual approach of the Indian peoples. But the basic character of India, her great all India background, her *Indianism,* her *Bhārata-dharma,* or *Bhārata-yāna,* is linked up with Sanskrit".[2]

"Apart from this very vital matter, Sanskrit is a great treasure-house for all Indian literary languages to draw their words of higher culture from. Modern Indian literary languages, whether Aryan or Dravidian, are no longer 'building languages', i.e. they do not create new words with their own native elements. With Sanskrit in the background and being nurtured in the bosom of Sanskrit, they have all become 'borrowing languages'. Any word in a Sanskrit book or the Sanskrit dictionary is a prospective Bengali or Telugu, Marathi or Malayalam word. The much-needed development of a scientific and technological vocabulary will mean a greater and still greater place for Sanskrit in modern Indian intellectual and cultural life".[3]

The interest and importance of Arabic and Persian to the Muslims in India resembled very much that of Sanskrit to the Hindus. The pan-Islamic view[4], which occasionally inspired sections of Indian Musalmans in the nineteenth century, underlined the importance of a knowledge of Arabic and Persian.

The importance of the English language was of a different character. It was not only the common language of the educated people all over India, but also the language mostly favoured by the upper and middle classes of people in each region in ordinary business and transaction of life. It was the language practically used by them in all spheres of life, and in all branches of education and learning except literature proper. It must be noted, however, that there was some English literature developed in India both by Indians and Englishmen.

2. *General Survey of the Character of the Literatures in the Modern Indian Languages.*

Modern Indian literatures are mostly the products of Western impact. Contact with the European spirit through English literature brought in a real Indian renaissance, and gave a new course to the literatures in modern Indian languages. English literature itself and the literatures of ancient, medieval, and modern Europe, to which English-knowing Indians had access through translations in English, revolutionised the attitude to life and literature, and inaugurated the current or modern phase in Indian literature. This contact with the European mind first began in Bengal and, by the middle of the 19th century, the emancipation or modernisation of the mind of Bengal and of Bengali literature had already begun. European methods of literary approach were eagerly adopted; an expressive prose style was established, and the drama, the novel, the short story and the essay were born during the sixties of the nineteenth century. The European type of blank verse, and verse-forms like the Italian sonnet were introduced. We have an astonishing floraison of literature in Bengali at first, and then gradually in other languages,—the development following, generally, a similar course as English education through schools and colleges began to shape the mind of the intelligentsia. India became linked up with the modern world in literature and the humanities.

It will thus be seen that next to English literature, the influence of modern Bengali literature has been one of the most potent forces in modern Indian literature. This is symbolized by the fact that Bankim-chandra Chatterji and Rabindra-nath Tagore have become pan-Indian in their effective power. Their writings have been translated into various Indian languages and not only stimulated their growth but influenced their further development in various ways.

Three other facts, though of secondary importance, considerably helped the growth and development of modern Indian literatures. The first was the printing press meant to publish books for the people which was set up by the Christian missionaries at Serampore in Bengal in A.D. 1800, and earlier in Goa and in Malabar. These were followed by several others in Calcutta and other parts of India, during the next twenty years, established both by the Indians and Europeans. The printing press created a much wider reading public and a greater degree of living interest in literature. This not only stimulated its further development, but also influenced, to a large extent, its future shape and course.

The second was the growing facilities of communication between different parts of India by improvements of road and transport, specially the extension of railways, which led to the gradual realization of a common nationality. Besides, subjection to a common administration also indirectly contributed to the development of Indian literature by extending the spheres and possibilities of reciprocal influence through exchange of ideas, widening the horizon of outlook, and enriching the contents of literature.

The third factor was the literary activity of the Christian missionaries as part and parcel of their proselytizing propaganda. The necessity of diffusing the knowledge of the Christian scriptures among the Indian masses who were ignorant of English forced the missions to translate the Bible into various local languages, and the missionaries had thus to cultivate their study. To this study they brought in their material resources and the scientific knowledge of linguistics as it developed in the West. Grammars and dictionaries of various languages were written in order to help to evolve a standard prose style which was lacking in most Indian languages at the beginning of the nineteenth century, and printing presses were set up to publish these as well as religious tracts. This and the general interest in local literature displayed by many of the missionaries laid the foundation, or in any case marked the beginning, of a prose style which constitutes an important characteristic of modern Indian literature.

Finally, it should be noted that all the languages dealt with in this chapter had evolved before the nineteenth century, and the history of their growth, including that of their literature has been dealt with in the preceding volumes. This chapter deals only with these languages and literatures as they developed in the nineteenth century. Many writers and literary schools had their beginning in the nineteenth century but their full development took place during the twentieth. These will be more fully discussed in the next volume.

II. SANSKRIT.[5]

The orthodox Pandits kept alive the study of Sanskrit during the nineteenth century, and their literary output was by no means insignificant. They were patronized by the Hindu rulers of Tanjore, Cochin, Travancore, and Mysore, in the south, and Kāshmir and Rājput States in the north. The old centres of Sanskrit learning like Vārāṇasī, Mithilā and Nadīyā also continued to be centres of Sanskrit learning.

The Sanskrit works written during the 19th century embraced various branches of literature such as religion, philosophy, poetry, drama, grammar, medicine, lexicography, and encyclopaedia

Viśvanātha Siṁha Vāghela (1813-54), ruler of Rewa, is the reputed author of no less than fifty works on Rāma cult (exposition of the details of Rāma worship, poems, songs, and musical plays). At Kāñchī (Conjeeveram in Madras) a Sannyāsī gave a systematic exposition of the 108 Upanishads and was hence named Upanishad Brahman. A Tamil scholar, Appayāchārya (died, 1901 A.D.) wrote a large number of philosophical works with a view to effecting a synthesis of Sāṁkhya, Yoga and Vedānta systems (*Anubhavādvaita*). The traditional learning in logic (*navyanyāya*) was kept up in Bengal as indicated by the *Adhyātmachaṇḍī* of Śivachandra.

"In the beginning of the 19th century, Rāghava Āpā Khāṇḍekar flourished at the well-known Mahārāshṭra centre of learning, Puṇyastambha, and wrote the lexicon *Kośāvataṁsa*, the astronomical works *Kheṭakṛiti*, the *Paddhatichandrikā* and the *Pañchāṅgārka*, and the literary work *Kṛishṇavilāsa*. More prolific was his Pañchavaṭī contemporary Achyutarāya Modak, who made varied contributions to poetry, poetics, religion and Advaita philosophy, nearly thirty works of his being known. The Tanjore Kannaḍiga authors Vāñchchheśvara and his great-grandson and namesake received patronage at Poona too; the latter received help at the hands of the Patwardhan Sardars and their ministers, and is well known for his Mīmāṁsā work *Bhāṭṭachintāmaṇi*; he wrote also on Dharma and Śrauta. In Nagpur flourished the poet Gaṅgādhara (1860-65) who produced eighteen works including two *Gītagovinda* imitations, *Saṅgītarāghava* and *Gaṅgāshṭapadī*. Advaitendra Yati (1780), author of *Dharmanaukā*, flourished near Ahmadnagar. Raghunātha Śāstri Parvate wrote a commentary on the *Gītā* called the *Padabhūshaṇa* and then the Advaitic polemic against Dvaita, the *Śāṅkarapādabhūshaṇa*, in 1848, under the patronage of Nānā Sāheb, Minister at Bhor".

"Rāmasvāmi Śāstri of Ilattūr in Travancore (1823) was a prolific writer; his *Kīrtivilāsa* Champū is on Āyilyam Tirunāl, *Surūparāghava*, a grammatical poem like *Bhaṭṭikāvya*, *Kaivalyavallīpariṇaya*, an allegorical philosophical play like the *Prabodhachandrodaya*, and *Kshetratattvadīpikā*, a work on geometry. His pupil Sundararāja was as prolific and versatile, and one of his best-known works is the one-act play on the triumph of the daughter-in-law against the mother-in-law, the *Snushāvijaya*. Keralavarma Valiya Koil Tampurān (born 1845) composed several hymns and poems, and when king Āyilyam Tirunāl interned him, gave vent to his feelings of dislike against the king in many pieces, and after release wrote the *Viśākhavijaya* on Viśākham Tirunāl."

"Cochin did not lag behind. During the time of Rāma Varma, Ārūr Bhaṭṭatiri (1830) wrote the *Uttara Naishadha*; Vīrakerala Varma, king in 1809-28, was an author of hymns; Goda Varma Yuvarāja of Cranganore was master of Śāstra and Kāvya, his monologue, *Rasasadana Bhāṇa,* being his best known work; his *Rāmacharita* was completed by Kochchuṇṇi Tampurān (1855-1926) who wrote also Goda Varman's life in *Vidvad-Yuvarāja Charita;* Kuññikkuṭṭan Tampurān of Cranganore wrote also one-act plays and a life of Śaṅkara. The *Mahishamaṅgala Bhāṇa* was produced in the time of Rājarāja Varman by the Nambūdiri of Mahishamaṅgalam".

In Kāshmir, the reign of Raṇavīra Singh (ascended 1857) witnessed a great amount of enthusiasm for Sanskrit. "Śivaśaṅkara compiled at this time the Dharmaśāstra digest, *Raṇavīraratnākara;* in Vedānta, Vāsudeva wrote the *Chittapradīpa;* Gaṇeśa of Jammu wrote the *Vishaharatantra* in medicine, and Lālā Paṇḍitīa, the *Praśnaratnāvalī* in Jyotisha. This King appears as the sponsor of no less than thirty-two works in all branches of Sanskrit literature. His chief Pandit Sahibram wrote, among others, a commentary on the *Pañchasāyaka* on erotics. Viśveśvara of the same court produced an encyclopaedia called *Raṇavīravijaya* and a treatise on prognostication derived from Muhammadan sources, called the *Skandhāsthipraśna;* and the *Bhūpālavilāsa* of Śivarāma is another interesting work of the same time dealing with different topics of royal interest and games and amusements".

A Sanskrit ritualistic text of the Bengal Vaishṇava sect, *Kṛishṇārchana-Chandrikā,* was composed by Rādhāmohan Śarmā who was probably also the author of *Kṛishṇa-bhakti-sudhārṇava.* The renowned Āyurvedic physician, Gaṅgādhara Kavirāja of Bengal (1798-1885), wrote the commentary *Jalpakalpataru* on the famous medical treatise *Charaka Saṁhitā.*

"Bengal produced two great encyclopaedic works, viz. *Śabdakalpadruma* and *Vāchaspatya,* compiled, respectively, by Rādhākānta Dev and Tārānāth Tarkavāchaspati, on modern lines. A third, *Śabdārthasarvasva,* compiled by Paravastu Veṅkaṭa Raṅgāchārya of Vizagapatam, is not yet published."

Among historical works may be mentioned the *Siddhāntavijaya* dealing with Pratāpasiṁha, Rājā of Satara.

Reference may be made to some women writers in the field of Sanskrit literature. "Triveṇī (1817-83), a Vaishṇava lady of Śrīperumbudūr and one who engaged herself also in some public work in the religious field, composed hymns, a couple of plays, two imitations of Kālidāsa's *Meghasandeśa* and two epic poems. Sundaravallī, authoress of a *Rāmāyaṇa Champū,* hailed from Mysore. Jñānasundarī of Kumbhakonam (died 1910) was highly gifted in this line, and among three women of recent times who tread the more arduous path of mastering Śāstras, mention may be made of a Telugu Brāhman lady of Māyavaram, Kāmākshī (widowed 1871), who has left glosses on Tarka and Advaita Vedānta texts, *Nīlakaṇṭhīya-vishayamālā*, *Advaitadīpikā* and *Smṛitiratnaprakāśikā*. Lakshmī, a princess of Kaḍattanāḍ (died 1900), wrote the poem *Santānagopāla*, indulging in difficult rhymes. Subhadrā of the Cochin royal house (1844-1921) composed devotional hymns".

Sanskrit literature also felt the impact of Western influence, though it came late in the nineteenth century and was mainly exhibited in the composition of short stories in prose, translation of poems and plays from English, and publication of journals of modern type. These new movements and models of composition will be more fully dealt with in the next volume. Two examples may be cited here. Rājarājavarma, a Kerala graduate and author of the grammatical work *Laghu Pāṇinīya*, composed a drama named *Aṅgalasāmrājya* which was an adaptation of Shakespeare's *Othello*. Panchānan Tarkaratna, an erudite Sanskrit scholar of Bengal, voiced the national and patriotic sentiments in his poems and particularly in the drama *Amaramaṅgala*, based on a story of Mewār.[6]

III. BENGALI

1. *Growth of Bengali Prose*

As noted above, there was no prose literature in the Bengali language before the nineteenth century. We have specimens of Bengali prose in the writings of a Portuguese Christian and a Bengali convert which may be dated in the closing years of the seventeenth and the first half of the eighteenth century. To the same period, or perhaps even an earlier date, belong the official documents of Tripura (Hill Tippera) State which adopted Bengali as the State language since the 15th or 16th century. Specimens of Bengali prose towards the close of the eighteenth century are furnished by the translation of a Sanskrit work *Bhāshā-parichchheda* and the official records of, and letters written to the authorities of the East India Company by the rulers of Tripurā, Cooch Behar, Assam, Manipur and Cāchār. The records represent a colloquial style, easily understood, which often shows foreign influence and hardly possesses any literary grace. The letters are so full of Arabic and Persian words, without any punctuation, that it is quite unintelligible even to a modern educated Bengali.

The history of Bengali prose literature really begins with the foundation of Fort William College in Calcutta in 1800 A.D. This college was established with a view to training the officials of the

East India Company in the different languages of this country. It had a Bengali section with William Carey, a missionary, as its head, and eight other teachers under him. Carey felt very keenly the lack of suitable text-books, and the authorities of the college encouraged the Bengali teachers in the department to compose new books by offering cash rewards. As a result of this, as well as of the personal example and encouragement of Carey, a large number of books were composed by the Bengali teachers during the first ten years. Even outsiders, encouraged by pecuniary help, followed their example. Among these authors special mention may be made of Rāmrām Basu, Mṛityuñjay Vidyālaṅkār, and Rājīb-lochan Mukhopādhyāy, whose first works were published, respectively, in 1801, 1802 and 1805 A.D. The most eminent among them was Mṛityuñjay Vidyālaṅkār, four of whose works were published before 1813. He developed for the first time an artistic literary style, and fully deserves the epithet, 'father of Bengali prose'. The credit is usually given to Rājā Rāmmohan Roy. But the first Bengali book of the Rājā was published in 1815 and his style is heavier and much inferior in literary merit to that of Mṛityuñjay. Though the numerous writings of the Rājā in Bengali prose greatly helped its development, still, as in the case of English education, he cannot be regarded as a pioneer in the field of Bengali prose literature.

The early Bengali books were mostly translations from Sanskrit, English and Persian, but there were three original compositions, all of historical character. Rāmrām Basu and Rājīb-lochan Mukhopādhyāy wrote, respectively, the lives of Pratāpāditya and Kṛishṇa-chandra Rāy, while Mṛityuñjay Vidyālaṅkār wrote a history of India from the earliest period to the times of Warren Hastings.

William Carey, to whom reference has been made above, looked to the technical side of the Bengali language and brought to bear upon it his knowledge of European languages. He composed a grammar of the Bengali language in 1801, and a Bengali-English dictionary in 1815. He wrote a book in colloquial Bengali in 1801 which anticipates the easy-flowing popular style for which credit is given to Pyārī-chānd Mitra. A part of it, if not the whole, was written by a Bengali, probably Mṛityuñjay Vidyālaṅkār. Another book, written by Carey in 1812, named *Itihāsamālā* or a collection of stories, shows his command over easy literary style in Bengali. On the whole the importance of Carey's contribution to the development of Bengali prose is very great indeed. The following passage from the Introduction to his Bengali Grammar shows his appreciation of the Bengali language and gives us a fair idea of its status at the beginning of the nineteenth century: "Bengalee is a language which is spoken from the Bay of Bengal in the south to the mountains of Bootan in the north, and from the borders of Ramgur to Arakan. It has been supposed by some, that a knowledge of the Hindoosthanee language is sufficient for every purpose of business in any part of India. This idea is very far from correct, for though it be admitted, that persons may be found in every part of India who speak that language, yet Hindoosthanee is almost as much a foreign language, in all the countries of India, except those to the north-west of Bengal, which may be called Hindoosthan proper, as the French is in the other countries of Europe. In all the courts of justice in Bengal, and most probably in every other part of India, the poor usually give their evidence in the dialect of that particular country, and seldom understand any other...

"The Bengalee may be considered as more nearly allied to the Sungskrita (Sanskrit) than any of the other languages of India;... four-fifths of the words in the language are pure Sungskrita. Words may be compounded with such facility, and to so great an extent in Bengalee, as to convey ideas with the utmost precision, a circumstance which adds much to its copiousness. On these, and many other accounts, it may be esteemed one of the most expressive and elegant languages of the East".

Carey has rightly pointed out that Bengali was more nearly allied to Sanskrit than other Indian languages. One of its effects was the close imitation of Sanskrit prose style by the Bengali writers. Even Mṛityuñjay Vidyālaṅkār, who could write easy graceful Bengali, adopted Sanskritized style in some of his books. Evidently, the father of Bengali prose was experimenting with different styles. Unfortunately, his heavy style was also adopted by many writers after him. Henceforth we find, in addition to purely colloquial Bengali, an easy and graceful, as well as a heavily Sanskritized, literary style in Bengali prose. The last style, which soon found favour among the educated, was mainly inspired by the very common desire of the authors to show off their learning and a repugnance to the easy colloquial words which were regarded as somewhat vulgar. The books written in this style were intelligible only to a few, and are now generally forgotten. Nevertheless, their authors did a grtat service to Bengali language by saving it from the dominating influence of Arabic and Persian which overtook Hindī. It is a remarkable fact that while the languages of Upper India came to be more and more Persianized and Arabicized, Bengali language, since the beginning of the nineteenth century, deliberately cast off this foreign influence and looked for sustenance and development to the rich resources of Sanskrit and the spoken language of the people. While the language was thus being remodelled and simplified, the Bengali writers drank deeply at the fountain of English literature which was becoming gradually accessible to them as a result of the spread of English education. These two factors seem to be at the root of the wonderful development of Bengali language and literature in the nineteenth century.

The first manifestation of this new spirit is to be seen in the growth of Bengali periodicals.[7] Although English periodicals appeared in Bengal shortly after the foundation of the British rule, there was no Bengali periodical before 1818. Three papers were published in that year of which the *Bāṅgāl Gejeṭi* (*Weekly Bengal Gazette*), published in May, was probably the first in the field, but did not continue for more than a year. The other two were brought out by the Baptist Missionaries of Serampore, about 15 miles from Calcutta. The first was a monthly journal named *'Digdarśana,* which was soon followed by a weekly called *Samāchāra-darpaṇa* (Mirror of News). This was the most important Bengali periodical of the early days, and fortunately almost complete file of its issues has come to light. It is thus an invaluable source of information, and has been drawn upon for materials in several chapters of this volume. We have the additional advantage of learning from it the news and views quoted from other papers which are no longer available.

The first issue of *Samāchāra-darpaṇa* was published on 10th *Jyaishṭha,* 1225 B.S., corresponding to May 23, 1818. It was to be published every Saturday morning and the price was fixed at Rs. 1/8/- per month. It was announced in the very first issue that the regular publication of the following items would form the chief features of the Weekly.

1. Appointment of Judges, Collectors and other officials.
2. Acts and Ordinances issued by the Governor-General.
3. News of India and Europe.
4. Commercial news.
5. Birth, marriage, and death news.
6. New discoveries in Europe and account of the new machines and industrial development contained in books imported from England every month.
7. Ancient history and culture of India and account of her learned men and books.

J. C. Marshman was the nominal editor of the paper, but it was actually conducted by Bengali Paṇḍits, among whom Jayagopāl Tarkālaṅkār and Tāriṇī-charaṇ Śiromaṇi deserve special mention.

At least seven other Bengali periodicals were started between 1820 and 1850. Rājā Rāmmohan Roy was the virtual, if not also the nominal, editor of one of these, *Saṁbāda-Kaumudī*, started in December, 1821. Here, again, we can hardly support the claim that Rājā Rāmmohan Roy was the pioneer in establishing vernacular and English journals in Bengal. In 1829, he, along with others, started two papers, *Bengal Herald* in English and *Baṅgadūta* in Bengali. But there were English and Bengali journals long before that.

It is hardly necessary to emphasize the great historical value of these old Bengali periodicals. An enterprising Bengali scholar has published extracts from these papers in three handy volumes. As we go through them a complete picture of Bengal in the twenties and thirties of the last century, with all its defects and shortcomings and urge for a new life, passes before our eyes, and we can discern in it the symptoms of a sudden awakening after lethargy of centuries; of new ideas and visions of hope and aspirations, of strange customs and beliefs, doubts and dissensions, conflict between the old and the new, and the faint beginning and gradual growth of those ideas and institutions which have gone to make up Modern India. The might of the political authority of the British rulers and the stories of their conquests and diplomacy, which have hitherto formed the staple food of Indian history, recede into the background; we stand face to face with a new generation of people casting off their slumbers of a thousand years and trace the travails of the birth of a new culture and new civilization out of the old.

But apart from this great value as source-materials of history, the Bengali periodicals are of great importance as landmarks for the development of Bengali language and literature. The variety of topics dealt with by them increased the elasticity of the language and made it a suitable vehicle of expression for all types of thoughts and ideas. It became gradually free from high-flown Sanskrit compounds and was already well on its way to that stage of development which rendered it possible for masters like Īśvar-chandra Vidyāsāgar, Bankim-chandra Chatterji, Rabindra-nāth Tagore and a host of other great, but less renowned, authors to transform it into one of the most beautiful and highly developed languages of the modern world. The extracts from these old periodicals, even of 1840-1850, would occasionally appear crude, and somewhat unintelligible, to an educated Bengali of the present day. But they were the foundations, well and truly laid by a generation of pioneers, on which the noble structure of modern Bengali language and literature was built up by the next two successive generations of Bengalis. The Bengali periodicals were the first milestone in the road of progress followed by Bengali language and literature, the end of which is marked by pillars now famous all over the world.

The periodicals were also great mediums for the spread of general knowledge and culture, and their value as such was gradually being appreciated by the people. The following extract from *Samāchāra-darpaṇa*, dated January 30, 1830, is an interesting revelation:

"We find from our survey that the subscribers to periodicals have been doubled during the last year. The editors of those papers are also publishing information about more and more distant countries and this has widened the knowledge of the people. When twelve years ago we first brought out this paper, many subscribers blamed us for writing about countries whose names were never even heard of by them. But we are glad to find that the periodicals in Calcutta edited by Bengalis publish news of many countries of the world and the people are anxious to know of the events happening in foreign countries, specially in England. A striking proof of this has recently come to our notice. A Calcutta Periodical recently gave a list of countries the news of which would be specially published in it. A few days later we received a letter from a Mofussil subscriber that in case we do not publish the news of all those countries he would cease to subscribe to our paper".

It is an interesting revelation how Bengalis were put in touch with the current affairs of the world. Towards the closing centuries of the Hindu rule, India's contact with the outside world gradually became less and less. Al-Bīrūnī noted this as a great defect in the character of Indians as far back as A.D. 1030. It is now generally recognized that this complete ignorance of outside world was one of the important causes of the downfall of the Hindus. Nor was there any great improvement in this respect during the Muslim rule, so far at least as the Hindus were concerned. Now we find that at one stroke, thanks to these periodicals, the Bengalis were learning a great deal of the world outside, and what is more important, the value of such a knowledge was being more and more appreciated. The influence of this factor on the development of culture can hardly be over-estimated. It would be hardly any exaggeration to say that an average Bengali educated man of 1830 knew more of the world outside in course of the preceding ten years than his forefathers did during the previous thousand years.

2. *Poetry.*

While the Bengali prose style was of recent growth, Bengali poetical literature had a long history before the nineteenth century, and many high-class works were produced by famous poets like Chaṇḍīdās, Mukundarām, Bhārat-chandra and many others mentioned in preceding volumes. These were based on religious themes, though occasionally and incidentally some secular topics were introduced. The last great master of the poetical styles which came into vogue, late in the 18th century, in poetical contests held in public, was Dāśarathi Rāy (1806-57), best known for his spontaneity of diction and similes.The first poet to break a new ground was Isvarchandra Gupta (1812-1859) who wrote poems on social and political themes and translated English verses. His style was artificial and he represented the transition from the old to the new school. The first great poet of the new school was Madhu-sūdan Datta (1824-73), distinguished by the Christian epithet 'Michael', who brought about almost an epoch-making change both in form and spirit of Bengali poetry. He introduced blank verses, hitherto unknown, and his epic, *Meghanāda-vadha-kāvya,* numerous sonnets, and other longer poems breathe a new spirit. Madhu-sūdan learnt a number of European languages—English, French, Italian, Greek, and Latin—,and studied Sanskrit and Telugu in addition. He used Indian themes but treated them in a distinctly modern i.e. European way. This is specially true of his *magnum opus,* the *Meghanāda-vadha-kāvya* (1861), a grand epic, based on an episode in the *Rāmāyaṇa,* in which he successfully naturalised the European blank verse in Bengali. "In his *Vīrāṅganā-kāvya* he essayed the style of the Heroides of the Latin poet Ovid, but with an epic grandeur all his own. In his *Vrajāṅganā-kāvya,* based on Rādhā-Kṛishṇa legend, he caught the depth of feeling of the old Vaishṇava poets, but in his own inimitable and modern way. He wrote a series of sonnets on the model of the Italian and a number of effective plays in various moods influenced by his European readings. He also tried to bring an echo of Homer's rolling hexameters into Bengali prose in his unfinished fragment "*Hekṭar-vadha*" or the "Slaying of Hector".[8]

Raṅgalāl Bandyopādhyāy (1827-1887) wrote some poems on Rājpuṭ chivalry and other historical episodes. His famous ode on liberty, particularly its first line (Breathes there the man who would like to live, though bereft of freedom), has become a permanent treasure of Bengali literature.

Two of the greatest poets of Bengal after Madhu-sūdan Datta were Hem-chandra Bandyopādhyāy (1838-1903) and Nabīn-chandra Sen (1847-1909). The former wrote an epic poem *Vṛitra-Saṁhāra* (a weak imitation of Madhu-sūdan's *Meghanāda-vadha-kāvya*), but is better known for his patriotic poems inspired by fervent nationalism. Nabīn-chandra Sen is the author of a triology of epic poems

(Kurukshetra. Raivataka, and Prabhāsa), giving a new interpretation of the life and message of Śrī-Kṛishṇa, a theme more philosophically handled by Bankim-chandra in his *Kṛishṇa-charitra*. Nabīn-chandra wrote three short biographies of Buddha, Christ, and Chaitanya in fine verses. His best known work is, however, *Palāśir Yuddha*, based on the decisive battle of Palāsi (Plassey). This great epic, and many shorter poems of Nabīn-chandra breathe a fervid sense of patriotism. Hem-chandra and Nabīn-chandra carried the Bengali poetry further on the line chalked by Madhu-sūdan. These three may be regarded as the great classic poets in modern Bengali.

Mention may also be made of Dwijendra-nāth Tagore[8a] (1840-1926), the eldest brother of Rabīndra-nāth. His *Svapna-prayāṇa* is a unique composition. It is an allegorical poem on a novel plan and shows a high flight of fancy and charming poetry.

The next phase of development was the romantic poems which began with Bihārī-lāl Chakravartī (1835-94) and culminated in Rabīndra-nāth. Many other poets like Surendra-nāth Majumdār (1838-78), Akshay-kumār Barāl (1865-1918), Mrs. Kāminī Rāy (1864-1933) and Dwijendra-lāl Rāy (1863-1913) were of a fairly high order, but have been cast into shade by the great genius of Rabindra-nāth.

3. *Novels*

The Bengali novels reached, even if did not exceed, the height of excellence attained by Bengali poetry. This type of literature was directly inspired by English novels. The first work which may be properly regarded as a novel was written by Bhūdev Mukhopādhyāy (1827-1894), a student of the Hindu College. But the greatest writer in the field was Bankim-chandra Chatterji (1838-94), whose first novel *Durgeśa-nandinī* was published in 1865, and was followed by many others in quick succession. They heralded a new era in Bengali literature for two reasons. In the first place, he introduced a new style in Bengali prose which continued to be the standard throughout the nineteenth century. Reference has been made above to the Sanskritized style of early prose writers which found favour among Bengali writers. Its long compounds and difficult Sanskrit words made it incomprehensible to most readers. A reaction set in and Pyārī-chānd Mitra (1814-1883) used the colloquial style, full of slangs, in his realistic story *Ālāler Gharer Dulāl* published in 1858. It was Īśvar-chandra Vidyāsāgar (1820-1891) who rescued the Bengali style from the pedantry of the Pandits and the vulgarity of the realists. He may be called "the father of literary Bengali prose". His style was graceful and dignified, but still a little too heavy, and not very suitable for novels. Bankim-chandra improved upon his style, and the form of Bengali prose introduced by him did not lose its mastery till the later days of Rabīndra-nāth in the present century.

Bankim-chandra's novels showed an astonishing vigour of the Bengali language, combined with beauty and simplicity. They also revealed a new world of romance and idealism undreamt of before. From his pen flowed, year after year, novels of outstanding merit, of all types and descriptions,—religious, historical, romantic and social. He showed for the first time that the ordinary life of a middle-class Bengali can be a subject-matter of a high-class novel, and religious and social views can be preached through novels without detriment to their artistic merit. He also proved that a book written in Bengali can rank with a first-rate English novel. Some of his novels were translated into English, and one in German, and this raised the prestige of Bengali literature in the eyes of the educated classes. Before him Bengali literature did not occupy a high place in the estimation of the educated Bengalis. The Sanskrit Pandits as well as the Anglicised section regarded it as vulgar and beneath notice. Proficiency in English was then the only title to fame, and no Bengali writer could hope for any credit in their eyes. It is interesting to note that even Madhu-sūdan Datta and Bankim-chandra, the two great pioneers and luminaries in the two main branches of Bengali literature, fell into the lure and both began their literary career in English. The first poetic work of the former was *Captive Ladie* (1849), and the first novel of the latter was *Rājmohan's Wife* (1864). It is a great good fortune of Bengali literature that both realized their mistake very early, and devoted their attention to Bengali literature.

Bankim-chandra was a versatile writer. Besides novels, he wrote religious treatises and a number of essays on a variety of subjects. He preached his religious views and patriotic sentiments through his writings, and made the Bengali language a fit vehicle for expressing the highest ideas on all conceivable subjects in the most beautiful form. For half a century he remained the uncrowned king in the domain of Bengali literature. One of his novels, *Ananda-maṭh* (Abbey of Bliss), which contains the famous song *Vande Māta-ram*, has attained an all-India fame on account of his patriotic fervour skilfully depicted in the form of a quasi-historical romance. While there is no doubt that Bankim was profoundly influenced by European thoughts and literature, his great originality as a writer and thinker is beyond all question.

Bankim-chandra opened the floodgate of novels, and since his days they occupy the most prominent place in Bengali literature. Among his successors special mention may be made of his brother

Sañjib-chandra (1834-89), Tārak-nāth Gangopādhyāy (1845-91) who portrayed a realistic picture of the domestic life of Bengal, Ramesh-chandra Datta (1848-1909) who wrote several historical and social novels, Svarṇa-kumārī (1855-1932), a sister of Rabīndra-nāth, and Śrīś-chandra Majumdār (died 1908) who dealt with rural life.

4. *Drama*

The next important line of development was dramatic literature. Towards the close of the eighteenth century (in 1795 and 1796 A. D.) a Russian named Herasim Lebedeff staged two dramas in Calcutta with the help of Bengali actors and actresses. These were translations of two English works. But it was not till 1831 that the first Bengali stage was set up by Prasanna-kumār Tagore. The two dramas selected for the first performance were Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar* and the English translation of *Uttara-Rāma-charita*. One or two years later, a Bengali gentleman named Nabīn-chandra Basu set up a stage in his own house where Bengali dramas were acted. Similar stages were set up by other individuals, both in Calcutta and mofussil, but the first public stage dates only from December, 1872. It was named National Theatre according to the prevailing spirit of the time. Since then public stages have continued in an unbroken career.

These performances led to the development of Bengali drama. The earlier dramas were either translations of Sanskrit and English or based on Puranic stories. The first drama which broke a new ground was *Kulīna-kula-sarvasva*, a comedy based on the evils of Kulinism, written by Rāmnārāyaṇ Tarkaratna (1822-1886). But in this line also Madhu-sūdan Datta was the first great genius who infused a new life into the Bengali dramatic literature. His first work, *Śarmishṭhā*, based on the story of Yayāti, was not a great success. But his historical drama, *Kṛishṇakumārī*, based on the story of the princess of Udaipur, and several comedies, exposing social abuses, were works of high order. The next dramatist, Dīnabandhu Mitra (1830-1873) also showed great dramatic powers. His famous drama *Nīla-darpaaṇa* (1860) which exposed the oppressions of indigo-planters,[9] created a great sensation at the time, and Mr. Long, a missionary, was imprisoned for publishing an English translation of the same. An interesting development was the patriotic or national drama to which reference will be made later. Rājakṛishṇa Rāy (1849-94) wrote a number of dramas, mostly on Puranic themes, and introduced the regular free verse—a remarkable innovation in Bengali dramas. Jyotirindra-nāth Tagore (1849-1925), an elder brother of Rabīndra-nāth, wrote several historical plays, and translated a large number of Sanskrit dramas in Bengali. The most successful playwright was Giriś-chandra Ghosh (1844-1912). Himself a highly reputed professional actor, he was a voluminous writer of dramas of all types—religious, Puranic, romantic, social and historical. Although many dramatic works were written before him, this class of literature was far below the standard reached in poems and novels. Giriś-chandra's genius raised Bengali dramas to a high level, and he was ably seconded by Kshīrod-prasād Vidyābinod (1864-1927) and Dwijendra-lāl Rāy (1863-1913). Mention should also be made of Amrita-lāl Basu (1853-1929), who excelled in farce and satire.

5. *Miscellaneous*

In addition to poems, novels and dramas, the Bengali literature was enriched by a variety of other branches. The most important of them was religious, philosophical and moral literature. The *Tattvabodhinī Patrikā*, started in 1843, contained a fine series of articles written in lucid style by Devendra-nāth Tagore, Īśvar-chandra Vidyāsāgar, Rāj-nārāyaṇ Basu (1826-99), Dwijendra-nāth Tagore (1840-1926) and others, each of whom rose to great fame as writer and also in other spheres of life. Akshay-kumār Datta (1820-86), who edited the paper, was a versatile writer of great repute and was the master of a graceful prose style. Next came Keśab-chandra Sen[9a] (1838-84), whose great fame as a religious leader has obscured his high qualities as a great Bengali writer. Finally, we have to mention the great Svāmī Vivekānanda (1863-1902), the great disciple of Śrī Rāmakṛishṇa, and the author of several religious treatises. He was a powerful writer both in English and Bengali and evolved a Bengali prose style, which was akin to the spoken language, but also suitable to serious dissertations.

The *Tattva-bodhinī Patrikā* was the forerunner of many great periodicals. Reference may be made to *Vividhārtha Saṅgraha* published by the Indian Vernacular Society and edited by Rājendra-lāl Mitra (1822-91). It was a mine of useful information in all branches of human knowledge. The great Rabīndra-nāth has referred to it in flattering terms in his autobiography. He read it with great interest in his youth and lamented the absence of similar periodicals in his old age. There were a few other periodicals of this nature. But by far the best periodical in Bengali was the *Bangadarśana* edited by Bankim-chandra from 1872 to 1876. The essays and criticisms published in it were of high literary merit and opened a new era in Bengali literature. In 1877 appeared the *Bhāratī*, edited for seven years by Dwijendra-nāth Tagore, then by his sister Svarṇa-kumārī, and lastly by her two daughters.

Reference may also be made to the cheap daily newspapers. Keśab-chandra Sen first introduced it, and later the *Hitavādī*, edited by Kālī-prasanna Kāvyaviśārad (1861-1907), and the *Baṅgabāsī* by Jogendra-chandra Bose (1854-1905) became very popular.

Several great writers have left their chief contributions in the form of essays or short tracts. The most notable among them were Bhūdev Mukhopādhyāy, Rāj-nārāyaṇ Basu, Rāmtanu Lāhiḍī, Chandra-nāth Basu, Akshay-chandra Sarkār, Kālī-prasanna Ghosh, and Hara-prasād Śāstrī.

Some writers of satire, both in the form of novels and poems, have attained great fame as literary men. Among them may be mentioned Kālī-prasanna Siṁha (1840-70), who also translated the *Mahābhārata* in prose, Indra-nāth Bandyopādhyāy (1849-1911), and Jogendra-chandra Basu (1854-1905).

There are several good autobiographies and biographies in Bengali literature. The former include lives of Rāj-nārāyaṇ Basu, Devendra-nāth Tagore and Śiva-nāth Śāstrī. Among the latter may be mentioned lives of Rājā Rāmmohan Roy by Nagendra-nāth Chaṭṭopādhyāy, of Madhu-sūdan Datta by Jogīndra-nāth Bose, and of Īśvar-chandra Vidyāsāgar by Bihārī-lāl Sarkār and Chaṇḍī-charan Banerjee. The lives of great patriots like Garibaldi, Mazzini and others by Jogendra-nāth Vidyābhūshaṇ (1845-1904) contributed to the growth of national and patriotic sentiments in Bengal.

It would thus appear that when Rabīndra-nāth Tagore (1861-1941) made his debut in various branches of Bengali literature in the eighties of the last century, Bengali literature had already attained a position of eminence. His life is almost equally divided between the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. There is hardly any branch of Bengali literature which he has not touched, and almost everything which he touched he adorned and enriched by his contributions. Poems, songs, novels, short stories, dramas, satire, autobiography and essays of all kinds—religious, social, political, educational and literary—, in every field, he left Bengali literature much richer than he found it. But he was the real pioneer in lyric poems, in songs in the modern spirit, and in short stories. His voluminous contributions in all these fields mark the beginning of a new development of Bengali literature towards the close of the nineteenth century, and will be dealt in the next volume. We may, therefore, close the account of Bengali literature with Rabīndra-nāth in the full blaze of his glory and heralding a new and more glorious era in Bengali literature.

Before we leave this topic it is important to emphasize the debt which Bengali prose literature owes to English literature and Western ideas. One of the most serious charges against the introduction of English education in this country is that it has diverted our attention from the vernacular which has consequently suffered a great deal. But the fact remains that the vernacular language and literature attained the highest development in Bengal where English education was the most advanced. We may contrast the result with that in Bombay, Madras and other parts of British India where the main stress was laid on the vernaculars and not on English, as in Bengal.

IV. ASSAMESE

As noted above, Assam was conquered by the British in 1826 and formed a part of Bengal. Assamese was looked upon as a dialect of Bengali, and only Bengali was taught in Assamese schools, to the exclusion of Assamese, up to the year 1873 when Assamese as the language of the people was restored to its rightful place in the schools and the law courts. The Assamese people were educationally backward and there was hardly any growth of Assamese literature during this period.

The Christian missionaries, Bronson and others, did pioneer work by writing a grammar and dictionary of Assamese, publishing religious (Christian) literature which helped to set up Assamese for modern requirements, starting a monthly magazine in Assamese, the *Aruṇodaya Samvād Patra* (1846), and writing text-books for schools in history, elementary science, and grammar, besides general Readers. A new literary style, based on the spoken language of Central Assam, came into being in this way. Ānandarām Dhekial Phukan (1829-59) was the first great Assamese writer of the present age. His younger contemporaries, who served their mother-tongue during the period of its neglect, were Hem-chandra Baruā (1835-96) and Guṇābhirām Baruā. (1837-95). Hem-chandra was a most versatile writer, who composed short novels as well as satirical dramas and a very good dictionary *(Hema-kosha)*. Guṇābhirām brought out in 1885 a magazine, the *Asam Bandhu.* A number of Assamese young men, educated in Calcutta, inspired by the phenomenal progress in Bengali literature, brought out a literary magazine, the *Jonāki* (moonlight) in 1889, which had great influence in the building up of modern Assamese literature.

The younger writers wrote short poems and lyrics in a modern spirit, and Bholā-nāth Dās (1858-1929) sought to emulate the famous Bengali poet Michael Madhu-sūdan Datta by writing an epic in Assamese in blank verse. But it was not favourably received on account of its "highly stiff style and Sanskritised language".

Lakshmī-nāth Bezbaruā (1868-1938) is regarded as the greatest figure in modern Assamese literature. He was a dramatist, a poet, an essayist, a short-story writer and humorist—all in one, and he distinguished himself in each line. His sketches of Assamese middle-class life and the Assamese villager still remain unsurpassed. He wrote serious plays as well as farces, and it is difficult to say in which branch of literature he excelled more than in others. He was one of the founders of the literary journal called *Jonāki* mentioned above.

Many other Assamese writers flourished towards the very end of the nineteenth century; their activities will be described in the next volume.

V. ORIYĀ

Moden Oriyā literature was developed, as almost everywhere else in India, under the impact of Western influence. Its beginning is associated with three eminent writers, namely, Phakir-mohan Senāpati, Rādhā-nāth Rāy and Madhu-sūdan Rāo.

The oldest among these three contemporaries was Phakir-mohan (1843-1918). He was a remarkable man in many ways. "He was well-versed in at least five languages, with a working knowledge of English, and was pioneer printer, publisher and journalist in Orissa".[10] His literary output was prolific. 'He translated, single-handed, both the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Mahābhārata*, from the original into modern Oriyā and tried his hand at short stories (the first to be written in Oriyā), ballads, hymns, narrative poems, rollicking satires and an epic on the Buddha'.[11] In spite of his versatility Phakir-mohan distinguished himself chiefly as a novelist, a career which he began almost at the end of the period under review, with the publication of his first novel *Chha-māna Āṭa-Gunṭha* (1901). It is a work of outstanding merit, depicting the life of poor villagers, exploited by money-lenders or landlords. Indeed, it was the striking feature of his novels that they dealt mainly with common men and simple village-folk—"uneducated weavers, barbers and peasants, the village chowkidar who himself was an accomplice of the dacoits, the unscrupulous and mischief-mongering maid-servants, etc."[12]

Rādhā-nāth Rāy (1848-1908) ushered in a new age in Oriyā poetry. His *magnum opus*, the *Mahāyātrā*, broke entirely new grounds. It was the first attempt to introduce blank verse in Oriyā poem in imitation of the Bengali poet Madhu-sūdan Datta, and, contrasted with the early medieval Oriyā poetry, shows "an advance or enlargement of ideas and thoughts, accompanied by new powers and forms of expression".[13] In particular he freed Oriyā verse from the verbal gymnastics which had become an indispensable part of poetry before his time. Another striking feature is the rapturous description of the natural beauties and past glories of Orissa. In his *Mahīyātrā*, based on the story of the last journey of the Pāṇḍavas, he made them come to Orissa, and this device enabled him to sing the beauty of the hills, rivers, the Chilka lake, and other landscapes of Orissa. The Western influence upon Rādhā-nāth is mainly shown in his new sense of patriotism. He makes the Fire-God at Purī tell the Pāṇḍavas that all the evils including servitude, from which the Aryans (of India) had been suffering, can be traced to the loss of spiritual power caused by rituals and ceremonies. He emphasizes the unity of India, the provinces being "separate only in name, equal in blood they are all". Besides the *Mahāyātrā*, Rādhā-nāth wrote a number of small romances in verse, many of them being in imitation of English poets. He was also the pioneer in modern Oriyā *Kathā-Sāhitya* in prose. His *Itālīya Yuvā* (Young Italian) was published in 1877.

Madhu-sūdan Rāo (1853-1912) wrote in a very forceful prose style a number of stories and essays, and his poetic genius was on the side of the lyric. His *Vasanta-gāthā* and *Kusumāñjaḷi* embody some of the highest flights of his imagination in the realms of Truth, and World, and Time. His sense of patriotism is portrayed in his *Utkala-gāthā*, a volume of lyrics.

The illustrious trio—Phakir-mohan, Rādhā-nāth and Madhu-sūdan—who inaugurated the modern Oriyā literature were life-long friends. Their efforts were supplemented by others. Rām-śaṅkar Rāy introduced the modern type of drama and devoted himself to dramatic literature for 37 years (1880-1917). He wrote twelve dramas, beginning with the *Kāñchi-kāverī* (1880), which were historical, religious, social, and farcical. Among other dramatists may be mentioned Jagamohan Lala, Kamapala Misra and Rājā Padmanābha Nārāyaṇa Deva of Parlakimedi (1872-1904) who wrote in collaboration with his teacher Śyāma-sundara Rāja-guru. The *Satīnāṭaka* of Jagamohan is regarded as one of the best Oriyā plays. Among the younger contemporaries of the venerable *Trio* may be mentioned also Nanda-kishor Bal, who "distinguished himself in historical and nature poetry".

A brief reference may be made to the Oriyā periodical literature. Two monthlies were started by the Christian missionaries in 1849 and 1861. The first indigenous newspaper, the Daily *Utkaḷa-dīpikā*, appeared in 1866. Five years later came out an Anglo-Oriyā fortnightly, the English portion of which was called the *Orissa Patriot*, and the vernacular part, *Utkaḷa-Hitaishiṇī*. The monthly *Utkaḷa-Darpaṇa* and fortnightly *Utkaḷa-Putra* both appeared in 1873, followed 14 years later by the weekly *Oḍiā*. Several other papers followed. All these papers had only a very small number of subscribers and hence most of them were shortlived.

Special reference may be made to the professed objects of two of these papers. The *Utkaḷa-prabhā*, started in 1891, wrote in the Foreword to its first issue that "it will be no exaggeration to say that there is really speaking no literature in Oriya language". Referring to the galaxy of Oriyā poets ending in Upendra Bhañja, it comments: "But the Bhanja poet has churned the ocean in his books and raised to the surface the poison of erotic sentiment. Such works can but serve to spoil the society. That is true literature by studying which the ordinary people of society are roused to their respective sense of duty, and which helps everybody to proper conduct, character-building and social behaviour. The Oriyas have no such literature, and so the society of Utkal has no means of progress. To supply this want, the *Utkaḷa-prabhā* has entered the field".[14] This heralded a new age in Oriyā literature. The *Utkaḷa-prabhā* announced the rise of a new school of poetry and Rādhā-nāth's *Mahāyātrā* was serially published in this paper.

"The *Utkaḷa-Sāhitya*, which appeared for the first time in 1304 *san*, corresponding to 1897, laid down its policy in the *Sūchanā* or foreword, to keep to the golden mean of appreciating the new literature while realising the value of the old, as the following relevant excerpt will show:

"Such change as has appeared in all the departments of life in the country due to western education had occurred also in things relating to literature. This change is very desirable—human society cannot continue in the same state, in the same condition. That would be unbearable for a living society. It is not wise to block the way to progress for the sake of tradition. On the other hand, ignoring the past, or want of confidence in it for the sake of the present, is, highly blameable. Those are wise who can steer clear of rocks on both sides. The *Utkaḷa-Sāhitya* has come forward in the hope of functioning in a representative capacity for both ancient and modern literature".[15]

VI. HINDĪ

The epoch of modern Hindī literature started at the beginning of the nineteenth century, but its progress was very small until the middle of that century. There was the beginning of a prose literature but its language—the *Khaṛī-Bolī*—was roughly the standard speech of Delhi, identical in grammar (though not in script, higher vocabulary and sometimes syntax) with Urdu, the Muslim form of

Hindī. The extent of this prose was very meagre, but side by side there was a vast literature in verse, almost entirely in other dialects and even languages (grammatically looked at)—in Brajbhākhā, in Awadhī, in Rājasthānī and in all mixed forms of speech. But there was hardly any poetry in the *Khaṛī-Bolī* language which was employed in prose. This disparity gradually disappeared in the second half of the nineteenth century and one common form of Hindī came to be used in both prose and verse, though a few authors still wrote in Brajbhākhā and Awadhī.

Like Bengali, Hindī prose owes its origin partly to the efforts of the Christian missionaries to translate religious texts and of the authorities of Fort William College in Calcutta to prepare suitable text-books for the use of their students. The first author of note is Lallūjī Lāl of Agra (1763-1835), a teacher in the Fort William College, who wrote his *Prem-sāgar* in 1803 on the story of Kṛishṇa's life as described in the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa.* This work was immensely popular and became the great model and exemplar for Hindī prose from the very beginning. It is one of the earliest Hindī (*Khaṛī Bolī*) prose classics, although its language occasionally smacks of the Brajbhākhā. Paṇḍit Sadal Miśra, a Bhojpuri speaking scholar from Bihar, also a teacher of the Fort William College, wrote another model work in *Khaṛī-Bolī* Hindī prose, the *Nāsiketopākhyān*, based on the well-known story of Nachiketas in the *Kaṭha-upanishad.* This work is also regarded as a landmark in the early modern Hindī prose.

The work commenced by the pioneers in the 18th century—Rāmprasād Nirañjanī, Paṇḍit Daulatrām, and above all by Munshi Sadāsukhlāl Niyāz,—came to be stabilized; and the Midland speech in its latest phase of a Sanskritised *Khaṛī-Bolī* Hindī started on its career of conquering nearly the whole of Northern India.

From about 1850, the prose style inaugurated by Lallūjī Lāl, Sadal Miśra and others was becoming gradually established, being greatly influenced by the simple prose style of Urdu and the rapidly developing prose style of modern Bengali. From 1850 to 1870 there was a period of hesitancy in Hindī—as if the people, trained in the Urdu language and tradition, were not yet sure of Hindī.

Then came Hariś-chandra of Banaras (1846-1884) who had the sobriquet of *Bhāratendu* (Moon of India). He is universally acknowledged as one of the makers of modern Hindī. He wrote dramas (original, as well as translations from Sanskrit and Bengali), poems and essays, and was a versatile writer of genius. He was followed in the process of developing modern Hindī by a number of able writers, including journalists; and, besides, a large number of translations form Bengali helped to model Hindī prose style on that of Bengali.

The next event of great importance was the foundation of the Ārya Samāj by Dayānanda Sarasvatī who adopted Hindī as the language of his preaching and propaganda. The progress of the Ārya Samāj, which has been discussed in the preceding chapter, had very great effect in reviving and spreading Hindī in the Panjāb, Western U.P. (where Urdu was dominating) and Rājputāna.

The progress of Hindī literature was not arrested after the death of Hariś-chandra (1884). The novel, the short story, the drama, besides new styles in poetry, began to flourish. Lālā Śrīnivāsa-dās of Mathurā (1851-1887) was a pioneer dramatist, whose romantic dramas *Raṇadhīr-Premamohinī* and *Saṁyogitā-Svayamvar* are well-known and were very popular. His *Parīkshā-guru* is one of the first original social novels in Hindī written in a fresh colloquial style.

In drama the Hindī literature has not made much progress save in one branch, namely, one-act plays. The greatest novelist and short story writer of modern Hindī is Prem Chānd (1880-1936). "Apart from his short stories, rivalling the best in any language and giving a most convincing and a sympathetic picture of the life of the people, he has some half a dozen bigger novels to his credit. His novels are social and analytic in their themes and their approach". But his activity really falls in the twentieth century and will be discussed in the next volume.

"The new styles of poetry, with a very large amount of Bengali and some English influence, came in during the second half of the nineteenth century. Among the more well-known poets mention may be made of Śrīdhar Pāṭhak (1876-1928), Ayodhyā Singh Upādhyāy 'Hari Audh' (1865-1946), and Maithili Saran Gupta. The last-named, born in 1886, and happily still alive, is the author of a number of narrative poems which are recognized among the classics of Hindī poetry.

Hindī journalism came into the field when Pandit Jugal Kishore of Kanpur started from Calcutta the first Hindī weekly, the *Udant Mārtaṇḍ* (the Rising Sun). Though it had a very short life, it inspired others, and a number of Hindī journals began to be published from towns all over the Hindī-using area. A Bengali resident in Banaras brought out the *Sudhākar* (1850) and Munshi Sadāsukhlāl published *Buddhi-prakāś* from Agra (1856).

A number of renowned journalists flourished in the second half of the nineteenth century. Bālmukund Gupta of Rohtak (1865-1907) and his two associates, Amṛita-lāl Chakravartī, a Bengali, and

Prabhu-dayāl Pāṇḍe, from Mathurā, edited from Calcutta a weekly paper, the *Hindī Bangavāsī,* which was the most influential Hindī newspaper during the two closing decades of the nineteenth century and considerably advanced the Hindī prose style. Mahābīr Prasād Dvivedī (1870-1938) was the editor of the well-known Allahabad journal, the *Sarasvatī,* which raised the tone of Hindī journalism, in both form and content, and helped a great deal in establishing a fine expressive Hindī prose style.

VII. MARĀṬHĪ

The decline of the political power of the Marāṭhās towards the close of the eighteenth century was followed by a period of decadence in the Marāṭhī literature. The age of Tukārām and Rāmdās was gone, and the writers of this period, though endowed with some poetical fervour, had to remain content with singing the war-like deeds of the past and amorous deeds of the present. The last remnants of them lingered even during the period under review in Anant Fandi and Prabhākar.

With the advent of the British rule the people were bewildered by the superiority of the British civilisation, and a spirit of defeatism overtook them. The link with the old traditional literature was broken. The writers of this period, though intellectually very high, appear to be struggling—groping as it were—in the literary field. There was a complete blank and the whole thing had to be started afresh. Soon the influence of Christian missionaries and English education made itself felt in Marāṭhī literature. As in the case of Bengali, Carey, with the help of a Marāṭhī Paṇḍit, Vaidyanāth Śarmā, began to develop Marāṭhī. During the period 1805 to 1818, ten books were written, including the *Grammar of the Maratha language* (1806), the *Marathi-English Dictionary* (1810), translations of stories from the Bible, and the *Pañchatantra* (1815). Three others, namely, the *History of Rājā Pratāpāditya* (translated from Bengali), *Battiś-singhāsana* and *Hitopadeśa* were really the works of Vaidyanāth, though often attributed to Carey.[15a]

The grammar was written in English and the dictionary was also very inadequate. Besides, the efforts made by Carey at Serampore took time to exert influence in the distant Mahārāshṭra. His example, however, inspired Elphinstone to found, in 1820, "The Native School Book and School Society" and he put Captain George Jervis (1794-1851) in charge of it, with a number of Śāstrīs or Paṇḍits to assist him. A Marāṭhī grammar prepared by them was long in use and formed the basis of later grammatical treatises.

Jervis also set his Śāstrīs on the work of a dictionary (1829). Later, in 1831, came out the famous *Marathi-English Dictionary* by Molesworth. These pioneer efforts satisfied the initial needs for the study of Marāṭhī.

This period that begins from 1810 or 1818 is pre-eminently a prose period. Not that poetry did not appear at all. It appeared, but did not thrive as the prose did. This prose again was altogether a new prose, because the writers themselves did not know that there was prose-writing in Marāṭhī in days gone by. The simple prose of the Mahānubhavas, the dynamic prose of Ēknāth, the forceful prose of the political despatches of the Peshwas, the beautiful prose of the *bakhars* which continued to be written by M. R. Chitnis (1815) and others—this whole tradition of elegant prose-writing was scarcely known to them. It is for this reason that the prose-writers of this period present in their writing a new form of Marāṭhī language and a new style. There is, in it, much influence of Sanskrit, as some of the writers were Śāstrīs, of Konkan dialects, as some came from Konkan, and of the English language as most of them were neo-literates in English.

The literature that appeared in this period was of a story-type, —stories translated from both Sanskrit and English. The most noteworthy writer in this early period was Sadāshiv Kāshināth *alias* Bapu Chhatre (1788-1830) who served as a 'writer' and later became an assistant to Jervis. Two of his books—*Bālmitra* and *Aesop's Fables* in Marāṭhī (1828)—are well-known. Bapu Chhatre may be said to be the father of modern Marāṭhī prose, and as instructor in the school he trained a good many young pupils of his in the art of writing. He was succeeded as a secretary by an illustrious pupil of his—Bāl Gangādhar Jāmbhekar (1810-1846), who later became the first native professor in the Elphinstone Institute (1835). He was noted for his high intelligence, for a number of books that he wrote, and also as a pioneer journalist in Marāṭhī. He wrote books on grammar, geography, history and calculus, but they were all of the school-text-book level. Hari Keshavji (1804-1858) was another contemporary writer, who was a good translator and gave us the *"Yātrik Kraman"*, translation of Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress,* in 1841.

But better known than any one else of this period was Dādoba Paṇḍurang Tarkhadkar (1814-1882), whose Marāṭhī grammar entered every Marāṭhī school and home, and who, on account of being the first recognized propounder of Marāṭhī grammar, was called the Pāṇini of Marāṭhī. Dādoba was a disciple of Bapu-Śāstrī and a co-student of Jāmbhekar. He served the Government in various capacities, and succeeded Jāmbhekar as Superintendent of Schools. He wrote a number of books; his *Marāṭhī Grammar* (1836) is the most distinct service to Marāṭhī language, and is still being used at several places. His autobiography, though incomplete, and his commentary of the *Kékāvali* of Moro Pant are two other books of recognized merit, one depicting the social history of his times and the other evaluating his place as a poetical critic.

The last, but not the least, of this illustrious batch of the four stalwarts of the early British period, was Parshurām Balwant *alias* Parashuram Pant Tatya Godbole (1799-1874). He was one of the four editors of the Marāṭhī lexicon (1829) which formed the basis of the later one by Molesworth. His help was also sought later on when another English-Marāṭhī lexicon was undertaken and finished in 1847 by Major Candy (1806-1877). But more than as a lexicographer, Parashuram Pant Tatya is known as the editor of the *Navneet* (1854), an anthology of Marāṭhī poetry. This collection of poems displays the best qualities of the creative critic that was in him. The prologue of the book shows what an appreciative, straightforward and modest heart he had. He says that 'these flowers—the best that he could find—the sweetest like a ball of sugar, are put together in a garland and offered to the receptive Marāṭhī reader'. The excellence of this anthology is proved by the several editions that it has already gone through.

Though this period was a preparatory and a school period, still it did not fail to educate the public in general. Advantage was taken of the newly introduced printing press, and periodicals were started. There were the *Darpaṇ* (1831) and *Digdarśan* (1841) of Jāmbhekar, the *Prabhākar* (1841) of Bhau Mahājan, and *Jñānodaya* (1842) of the missionaries. The *Jñānprakāśa* was started in Poona in 1849 and was followed by the *Vichāralaharī* (1852), the *Vartamāndīpikā* (1854) and the *Induprakāśa* (1862) in Bombay. All these efforts laid a firm foundation of the Marāṭhī journalism, which, with the classical touch of the *Nibandhamālā* (1874) of Vishṇuśāstrī Chiplunkar, ripened into an all-sided development, the fruits of which we see in the *Késarī* (1881) of Lokamānya Tilak, *Sudhārak* (1888) of Principal Agarkar, the *Kāl* (1898) of S. M. Paranjpe, and many others.

There is one more characteristic of this period. The success of the individual writers inspired some others to collective and cooperative work and led to the establishment of some literary bodies and societies. The Book and Tract Society (1827), The Students' Literary and Scientific Society (1848), and The Jñānprasārak Sabhā (1848), The Dakshina Prize Committee (1851), and many others are instances in point. Some of these societies brought out books, some gave prizes to writers, some conducted schools, while others had periodical meetings and discussions.

There was thus a general awakening all through. Since the establishment of the University of Bombay, in 1857, the progress both in the spread of education and the creation of literature became regular, orderly and on right lines. Though it was all Western, it did not fail to create among the people the spirit of nationalism and democracy; nay, it was because of it, that these new ideas were imbibed by the people.

We may now proceed to show how the different literary forms developed since the starting of the University.

The story literature, the first phase of which is seen in the *Bālbódhmuktāvali* (1806), *Hitópadésa* and *Pañchatantra* (1815), later developed into school stories such as *Bālamitra* and *Aesop's tales* (1828) of Bapu Chhatre, *Bódhkathā* (1831) and *Nītikathā* (1838). Tales from other languages, like Sanskrit, Persian and English, were translated with the same view. Kṛishṇa-śāstrī Chiplunkar (1824-78) translated the famous *Arabian Nights* (1861-65). Lamb's *Tales from Shakespeare* was rendered into Marāṭhī by Sakharam P. Pandit (1867). Ravji-Śāstrī Godbole translated *Robinson Crusoe* (1871) and Kṛishṇa-śāstrī Chiplunkar and his son translated *Raselas* in Marāṭhī (1873). From story to novel was not a long journey. The social condition of those times—especially the question of female education, remarriage of widows, foreign travel, and a host of other topics—gave rich material to the novelists. Bābā Padmanji (1831-1906) gave the first original novel in Marāṭhī (1857)—*Yamunā Paryaṭan*—the sojourns of Yamunā, a Hindu widow, describing in it all the miseries that she had to go through, incidentally eulogizing Christianity at the cost of Hindu religion. Lakshman Moreshwar Halbe wrote two original social novels,—*Muktamālā* and *Ratnaprabhā* (1866). Another compeer of his, Naro Sadashiv Risbud, composed *Mañjughóshā* (1868) and *Vishwāsrāo* (1870). History, also, gave enough material for novel-writing, the result of which we find in the *Mochangaḍ* (1871), depicting an incident in Shivāji's life, by Rāma-chandra Bhikaji Gunjikar (1843-1901), and in *Ghāshirām Kotwal* (1873), by Morobā Kanhobā Vijaykar.

This form of literature was pursued with great success by Hari Nārāyan Apte (1864-1919), who combined in him the characteristics of Walter Scott, Dickens, and Thackeray. He enriched the Marāṭhī literature by writing a number of novels. Apte was a social reformer and wielded his powerful pen in exposing and trying to mend the social evils. His novels depicting the society of the time, such as *Madhali Sthiti* (1885), *Ganpatrao* (1887-88), and *Pan Lakshat*

Kon Gheto (1890-93), have become classics in Marāṭhī. He had an equally great success in historical novels as is shown in *Gad Ālā pan Sinha Gélā* (1903), *Ushahkāla* and *Sūryódaya* (1905-08). He created a tradition and influenced quite a number of both contemporary and later writers. Nārāyan Hari Apte, Vithal Sitārām Gurjar and many others belong to this tradition. S. M. Paranjpe and C. V. Vaidya—great scholars themselves—successfully tried their hands in novel-writing.

The Marāṭhī drama went in line with the novel in development. Though its origin is found in a crude form in Rāmlīlās, Daśāvatāras, Gondhals and such other mystery plays, still, owing to the influence of both Sanskrit and English drama, it developed into a full-fledged one. Vishṇu Amritu Bhave was the first originator of modern Marāṭhī stage. He, with the help of princes of some States started this movement in 1843, by staging his improvised plays based on the incidents from the epic legends. The *Prasannarāghava* was the first full-fledged play in Marāṭhī (1851). Later on came the plays translated from Sanskrit by Parasuram Pant Godbole—the *Venīsaṁhāra* (1857), *Uttara-Rāma-charita* (1859), *Śakuntalā* (1861)—and by Kṛishṇa-śāstrī Rājwade—*Mudrā-Rākshasa* (1867), *Śakuntalā* (1869)—, and from English by Mahādeo-śāstrī Kolhatkar (*Othello*). Two historical plays were written by V. J. Kirtane (1840-1891), namely, *Thorale Mādhavrāo* (1861) and *Jaypāl* (1865). Social plays also came to be written during the period viz. *Manóramā* (1871) by M. B. Chitale, and *Swairkeshā* (1871) by Raghunāth-śāstrī Abhyankar. Music was introduced in the play by Sókar Bāpuji Trilokekar (1879) and Balwant Pāṇḍuraṅg *alias* Annāsāheb Kirloskar (1880), thus changing the prose drama into an opera. Music came to be tried with great success later on by the illustrious trio of dramatists—Govind Ballāl Deval, Kṛishṇaji Prabhākar Khadilkar, and Shripad Kṛishṇa Kolhatkar—who practically ruled the Marāṭhī stage for a long time; Deval by his *Shārada* (1905) and *Samshyakallól;* Khadilkar by his *Sawai Mādhaoraochā Mṛityu* (1893) and *Kānchangadchi Móhanā* (1898); and Kolhatkar by his imaginative plays, *Vīrtanay* and *Mativekar*.

Poetry, the third form of creative literature, was in a decadent stage at the beginning of this period. But later on, when it came into contact with the Western poetry, from 1857 onwards, it prospered. Hansarāja (1798-1855) and Dr. Kīrtikar B. D. Palande (1832-1874) wrote poetry in the old traditional way. Gaṇeś-śāstrī Lele translated from Sanskrit, and Bajaba Pradhān, from English. Some original poetry was given by Viṭhoba Annā Daftardār (1813-1873) and Chintāmani Péthkar (1851-1879). Quite a revolutionary attempt is seen in the pseudo-epic poem, *Rājā Shivāji* (1868), of M. M. Kunte.

But the real lyric poetry, quite similar to that in English literature, appears from 1885 onwards in the poetry of Keshavasuta—Kṛishṇaji Keshav Dāmlé (1866-1905). Keshavasuta was the foremost of that illustrious band of poets,—Rev. N. V. Tilak (1862-1919), Vināyaka Karandikar (1872-1909), Mādhavānuj (1872-1916) and D. K. Ghate (1875-1899). This was the new poetry—the poetry of love, of nature, of society and nationalism, and of mysticism. There was thus a change both in the content and the way of expression. This particular new form is still domineering in modern Marāṭhī poetry.

The period (1818-1905), however, though not rising to a high level in point of creative literature, is very rich in the other form of literature, viz. the interpretative one. The high role of the intelligence and the might of the pen are seen in the various essays and articles, in the dissertations and expositions, in the theses and the commentaries that appeared during this period. The printing press and the periodicals gave an impetus to this type of writing. Jāmbhekar and Mahājan had already prepared the ground, and Gopāl Hari Deshmukh alias Lokhitawādi (1823-1892) contributed his *'Shatpatre'*—the Century of Letters—to the *Prabhākar* of Bhau Mahājan on various subjects. In fact there was a very good batch of young writers formed by G. N. Madgaonkar, Bābā Padmanji, Kṛishṇa-śāstrīi Chiplunkar, V. N. Mandalik, Vishnubuwa Brahmachārī, Jotiba Phule, and others, who wielded their mighty pen in reforming and reawakening the society and thus enriched the literature of the time. The topmost personality, of course, belonged to Vishṇu Kṛishṇa-śāstribuwa Chiplunkar (1850-1882), a worthier son of a worthy father. His *Nibandhamālā* (1874) roused the people from their stupor. His was a mightier pen nourished, as he says, on the milk of the tigress—the English literature. The forceful and elegant prose of Chiplunkar was a great source of inspiration to all subsequent writers, the most notable among whom were Lokamānya B.G. Tilak (1856-1920) and Principal Agarkar (1856-1895). These three masters and makers of modern Marāṭhī prose were followed by writers like V. K. Rājwade (1863-1926), S. M. Paranjpe (1864-1929), N. C. Kelkar (1872-1947), K. P. Khadilkar and others. Inspiration from them was also taken by novelists, dramatists, poets, and other creative writers, the prominent among them being H. N. Apte, Keshavasuta, Kirloskar, Deval and others. These writers, though influenced by the Western literature, had much of the East in them. They can be rightfully said to be the makers of the classical period of modern Marāṭhī language and literature.

VIII. GUJARATĪ

The history of Gujarātī literature during the period under review may be conveniently divided into three sub-periods,—the first, from 1818 to 1852, the second, from 1852 to 1886, and the third, from 1886 to 1905.

1. *1818-1852.*

This may be regarded as the period of transition from the old to the new. It is true that, in point of time, the most creative phase of the great poet Dayārām (1776-1852) falls within this sub-period, but his works, as well as those of the other great poets of the Svāmī-Nārāyaṇa sect, belong to the earlier period, in inspiration, technique, form and idiom. These have, therefore, been dealt with in the preceding volume. What demarcates this sub-period (1818-1852) from earlier period is the effort made under the influence of Western contact to shape Gujarātī as a vehicle of modern expression.

The progress of English education, the foundation of educational associations and newspapers, and the efforts of Christian missionaries gave a great impetus to Gujarātī language. A few landmarks in the process of imparting vitality to the language may be noted. In 1814 Archdeacon Barnes founded "The Society for Promoting the Education of the Poor within the Government of Bombay", usually styled 'Bombay Education Society'. This Society began its active career in 1820 by starting six schools—four in Bombay city, one in Surat and one in Broach; in 1826 another school was started in Ahmadabad.

About 1825, a branch of the Society acquired the services of Raṇchhoḍbhāi Girdharbhāi (1803-1873), a young man who had learnt English from a retired soldier of Broach. He produced the first series of Gujarātī text-books, undertook the training of teachers, and became the guide, philosopher and friend of almost all the aspiring young men who, under his inspiration, took to literature and social reform. A leading part was taken by the students of the Elphinstone College, founded in 1827, and the products of the Bombay University, founded in 1857, carried forward the work from about 1885.

In 1846, A. Kinloch Forbes, stationed at Ahmadabad as an Assistant Judge, began his study of the language and history of Gujarāt in right earnest, and soon secured the services of the poet Dalpatrām Ḍāhyābhāi, who collected for him old manuscripts and folk-songs and folk-tales. In 1848, Forbes founded at Ahmadabad 'The Gujarāt Vernacular Society' (now called the 'Gujarāt Vidyā Sabhā') which, in 1850, started its first fortnightly organ, the *Buddhiprakāś*. When transferred to Surat, Forbes founded a similar society there and promoted a literary journal, the *Surāṭ Samāchār*.

Apart from the valuable help he rendered to Forbes, poet Dalpatrām was an outstanding literary figure in his own right. His early inspiration came from the poets of the Svāmī-Nārāyaṇa cult, but his close association with Forbes inspired in him a zeal for social reform which found expression in his poems. Some of these poems soon found a place in the early text-books of the language, and exercised a great influence on the younger generation for wellnigh forty years. He also wrote a poem, *Hunnarkhānnī Chaḍāī* (The Invasion by Industry), in 1850, on the evil effects of modern industries on Indian crafts, possibly the first exposition of *Swadeshism*.

2. *1852-1886*

The outstanding literary figure of this sub-period was Narmadāshankar Lālshankar (1833-1886), popularly known as Narmad, who was a born rebel. He fought against caste, orthodoxy and social conventions. He was ex-communicated by his orthodox caste again and again. He married a widow, challenged orthodoxy whenever he could, and bore social persecution with pride. In spite of several trials, his faith in human dignity and individual freedom remained unshaken to the last.

Narmad had a romantic temperament characterised by free movements of the imagination, a deep-seated horror of convention and an inveterate tendency to exaggeration. His temperament was egotistic; his creative power, limited; he was denied the sense of delicacy. All these found expression in whatever he wrote, particularly in his poems. He also wrote a large number of essays. His principal works are the *Piṅgalprakāś*, a work on Gujarātī prosody (1857); *Alaṅkārpraveś*, a manual of figures of speech (1858); *Ras-Praveś* and *Nāyikā-Vishaya-Praveś*, a favourite subject of Sanskrit and Vraja poets. He also prepared and published the *Narmakośa* (1873), the first Gujarātī dictionary, and compiled the *Narmakathākośa*, a dictionary of mythology.

His *Dharm-vichār* (1885) is an outstanding work, in which he tried to adjust the new, which he had worshipped so far, with the old which he had begun to appreciate. He also left an unfinished autobiography, the *Mārī Hakikat* (1933).

Narmad is justly regarded as the father of modern Gujarātī prose. In his hands Gujarātī prose, used by Raṇchhoḍbhāi in his earlier text-books and developed by his disciples, underwent a complete change. In fact, he found it a feeble vehicle of modern expression and left it a rich language of great promise. He was the first author in modern Gujarātī who drew upon the memory of past greatness in stirring words.

The only other important prose-writer of this sub-period was Navalrām Lakshmīrām (1836-1888), Narmad's friend and associate. By his essays, he established a sober tradition of literary criticism for Gujarāt. His prose style, balanced and restrained, was a definite advance on Narmad's. He wrote the *Bhaṭ-nu Bhopālu* (1867) (The Bhaṭa's Exposure), an adaptation of Molière's comedy, from Fielding's version; *Vīrmatī* (1869), a historical play, and *Kavi Jīvan* (1888) (The Life of the Poet), being a biography of Narmad.

Other important works of this period are *Vanrāj Chavḍo* (1881) and *Sadhrā-Jesaṅg,* by Mahipatrām Ruprām (1829-1891), and *Karaṇ Ghelo* (1866) by Nandshankar Tuljāshankar (1835-1905), both being junior associates of Raṇchhoḍbhāi. But the best attempt at writing fiction during this period was made by Jehāngir Ardeshir Tālyārkhān in his works *Ratnalakshmī* (1881) and *Kulin ane Mudrā* (1884).

Bhoḷānāth Sārābhāi (1822-1886), under the influence of the Brāhma Samāj, burst into psalms, rich in prayerfulness. His *Iśvar Prārthanā Mālā* (1872) is a landmark in the cultural history of Gujarāt. Prayer, for the first time in centuries, emancipated from the Puranic imagery, lifted its voice in true humility.

With the Muslim conquest (1305), Gujarāt had lost its stage and drama. These were revived by the study of Shakespeare. Raṇchhoḍbhāi Udayrām (1837-1923) wrote the first modern Gujarātī play, *Jaykumārī,* in 1862, and translated, in collaboration with others, Lamb's *Ten Plays of Shakespeare* under the title *Shekspiār-Kathā Samāj.* Later, he wrote many plays on Puranic and social subjects which were staged; his best known play is *Lalitādukhdarśak* (1866).

3. *1886-1905*

A year after Narmad's death, i.e. 1887, Govardhanrām Mādhavrām Tripāṭhī (1855-1907) published the first volume of his gigantic work *Sarasvatīchandr;* its fourth and the last volume appeared in 1901. During this sub-period, right up to 1905, when his last works were published, he remained the pre-eminent author in Gujarātī literature.

Govardhanrām's fame rests on *Sarasvatīchandr*, a saga of the new life of India beginning from the eighties of the last century with all its beauty and ugliness. Its hero is a product of the new university education, a visionary, studious of self-perfection, awakened to an exaggerated sense of independence, and too self-righteous to adjust himself to the realities of life. In this work Govardhanrām, like some other great authors, laid the foundation of the new literature of modern Gujarāt by displaying the courage to face emotional, intellectual, social and spiritual truths, making the inner life of the individual the central theme of literature.

In this novel, again, Gujarātī prose, though at places rather heavy, became, for the first time, a fitting medium for conveying the inner experience of an educated Indian. For this purpose the author pressed into service the traditional style of Sanskrit prose works, the vigour and expressiveness of the English language, the idiom of the old-Gujarātī masters, and the homely phrases current in the ordinary life of the day.

The *Sarasvatīchandr*, as a work of fiction, is poor, but as a record of the impact of the West on the thought, outlook and life of India, it is the most outstanding work in Gujarātī literature. It exerted profound influence on Gujarāt during the last decade of the 19th century and the first decade of the 20th.

Govardhanrām's other works are *Sāksharjīvan* (1899-1903), *Navaljīvan* (1891), an essay on Navalrām, the *Līlāvatījīvankalā* (1905), a short biography of his daughter, and *Dayarām-no Akshardeha* (1908). He also wrote a poem, *Snehamudrā*, in 1889, and an English essay, *The Classical Poets of Gujarāt*, in 1894.

Maṇilāl Nabhubhāi Dvivedī (1858-1898) was the second of the outstanding trio of this period. He was an erudite scholar, a Vedantic thinker, and brought into Gujarātī language, more than any other author, an element of expressive vigour by fusing the resources of Sanskrit and English. His trenchant criticism of the school of social reform, which may conveniently be styled *Buddhivardhak* or Narmad school, served to a large extent as a restraining influence on the extravagant claims of the iconoclasts.

Most of Maṇilāl's works consisted of essays, which were published in his magazine *Sudarśan*, and ultimately collected in what is called *Sudarśan Gadyāvali* (1909). His poems were collected under the name of *Ātma-Nimajjana* (1895), many of which are *ghazals* after the style of the Persian Sūfī poets. His other works are *Kāntā*, a play (1882); *Gulābsinh*, a novel, being an adaptation of Bulwer Lytton's *Zanoni* (1897); *Bālavilāsa* (1893); *Siddhāntsāra* (1895), a work dealing with ancient Hindu thought and modern problems.

The most outstanding poet of the sub-period was Narsinhrāo (1859-1937). His *Kusummālā* (1887), inspired by Palgrave's *Golden*

Treasury of Songs and Lyrics, was published in 1887, the same year in which *Sarasvatīchandr*, Part I, was published, and laid the foundation of modern lyrical poetry in Gujarātī. In this work, as well as in the *Hṛidayavīṇā* (1896) and the *Nūpurjhaṅkār* (1914), one comes across odes, sonnets and lyrics, reminiscent of English poetry of the age of Wordsworth and Shelley. In the elegy written on the death of his son, *Smaraṇsaṁhitā* (1915), delicacy of pathos and elegance of language are combined to produce one of the finest works in modern Indian literature.

Though essentially a poet, Narsinhrāo was equally great as an essayist, critic and philologist. His works are: *Manomukur* (1924), a collection of essays; *Abhinayakalā* (1930) and *Vivartlīkalā* (1933), —works on the histrionic art; *Smaraṇ Mukur* (1926), containing his reminiscences of some friends and relatives. His diary was published posthumously (1956).

As a critic and a scholar, Narasinhrāo still remains unrivalled. In the *Premānandanā-nāṭako*, he exploded the myth that the dramas attributed to the medieval poet Premānand were genuine. In 1905, he wrote *Joḍaṇī*, a treatise on spelling. In the Wilson Philological Lectures delivered in 1915 at the University of Bombay in English, and published later (1921,1932) under the heading *Gujarātī Language and Literature*, he laid the foundation of a historical and philological study of the Gujarātī language and literature.

As noted above, Narshinhrāo's literary activity was prolonged far beyond the period under review. But he essentially belongs to the period which preceded the age associated with Nānālāl's poetry and Munshi's novels.

Among other leading poets was Manishankar Ratnajī Bhaṭṭ (1867-1923), also known as Kānt. Most of his poems are now collected in a volume entitled *Pūrvālāp* (1923). He also wrote two plays *Guru Govindsinh* and *Roman Svarājya* (1924), and translated an episode from Goethe's *Wilhelm Meister*,—the *Eka Devinu Vṛittānt* (1897). He was also an accomplished essayist. But his forte was lyrical poetry which during this period reached its high-water mark in his *Vasantvijay* and the *Chakravāk-Mithun*.

Sursinhji Gohel, Thakor of Lāṭhī (1874-1900), wrote under the pen-name, Kalāpī. He was a sensitive young man and poured out his bleeding heart spontaneously when he struggled in vain to love two women at the same time. His poems were collected after his death and published under the title *Kalāpīno Kekārav* (1903), giving him a prominent place in Gujarātī poetry. Another author of great distinction was Balvantrāi Kalyāṇrāi Ṭhakor (1869-1952). He wrote little, but whatever he wrote was perfect, and his works, published in the next period, laid the foundation of a new poetical technique.

Ramaṇbhāi Mahipatrām Nīlkaṇṭh (1868-1928) reacted against the conservatism of Govardhanrām and Maṇilāl with characteristic humour, a new element introduced by him in Gujarātī literature. He held up the orthodoxy to ridicule, particularly in his great satirical work *Bhadraṁbhadra* (1900). He also wrote *Rāino Parvat*, a play (1914); *Hāsyamandir* (The Temple of Laughter), a collection of humorous skits (1915); and *Kavitāe Sāhitya* (Poetry and Literature), a collection of essays on literary criticism in four volumes (1926-29). His work as a critic was a distinct advance on the earlier authors. He tried to formulate a theory of artistic and literary beauty, which was influenced by the theories of eminent English critics of his time.

A number of novels and historical romances were attempted, during the period under review, but none of them reached a high order of literary technique. In the last ten years of this period, the traditions of the Gujarātī stage underwent a revolutionary change in the hands of the new theatrical companies which had come into existence. The plays followed the tradition of Raṇchhoḍlāl Udayrām, but were poor in literary worth, till about the end of the period, when Ḍahyābhāi Dhoḷśāji brought the Gujarātī stage to a more artistic level, and the plays which he wrote had a literary flavour. It was in the next period that these plays roused popular enthusiasm and exercised considerable influence on life. During this period, works in old Gujarātī were rescued by a band of enthusiastic scholars, and edited and published mostly under the patronage of the Gaekwad of Baroda.

The phase of Gujarātī literature described above came to an end in 1905 when a new age began with the publication of *Vasantotsav* by Nānālāl.

IX. TAMIL

The eighteenth century was a period of stagnation and decay in Tamil literature. Thāyumānavar was the inevitable exception to the general rule. But already the seeds of a new literary harvest had been sown and a cross fertilization of the soil had taken place. Islam and Christianity had come to stay in the Tamil country and a cosmopolitan culture was in the making. The beginning of the nineteenth century saw the progressive consolidation of British power, and the comparative peace and settled condition that it brought was auspicious for gifted men to pursue the exacting profession of letters. The court of the Marāṭhā King, Serfoji, Raja of Tanjore, now became the meeting ground of men of letters, and many a writer received the royal patronage. Tamil classics were no longer quite as inaccessible as formerly, and works like Thāyumānavar's lyrics and the *Tiruvilayādal Purānam* were printed and widely read. The College of Tamil Pandits at Fort St. George did much useful spade work by collecting and publishing old classics. The impact of English, at first imperceptible, slowly influenced the texture, form and content of the language of the Tamils. Prose of a characteristic variety there always was in Tamil—as seen in the *Śilappadikāram*, or in the commentaries on grammatical or other works of former times. Intimacy with English led Tamil writers to essay prose for various practical as also artistic purposes. In 1826, Tāṇḍavarāya Mudaliyār issued his prose *Pañchatantra*. By and by, there was a flood of Tamil prose—as yet wavering uncertainly between unintelligible pedantry and Anglicised jargon—and works of fiction, drama, history, translations and collections of essays, popular manuals and biographies, came tumbling from the new printing presses set up all over the Tamil country. The Modern Age in Tamil literature had indeed begun—confusedly and uncertainly, distracted by false lights and half-lights, nevertheless puissant in its suggestion of possibilities and youthful in its wide-awake curiosity and scent for adventure.

The greatest, perhaps, of the Tamil poets of the nineteenth century was Rāmalinga Swāmigal (1823-74), whose *Tiruaruṭpa* is a marvellous collection of nearly one thousand devotional hymns. The lyrics addressed by him reverently to the Śaiva Āchāryas—Appar, Sundarar, Sambandar, and Māṇikkavāchakar—are among the best of their kind. Simple and direct in diction, homely in their imagery, candid in their utterance, Rāmalinga Swāmigal's songs appeal to us at once, and several of them achieve a melting grape-like quality before which criticism is perforce dumb. Rāmalinga Swāmigal's almost exact contemporary, Ārumuga Nāvalar (1822-76) of Jaffana, was a staunch Śaiva, and he issued reliable editions of many standard Tamil works from his printing press at Madras. He was a forceful writer of prose and played a notable part in the renaissance in the Tamil country. Mīnākshisundaram Piḷḷai was a profound scholar and voluminous writer of Tamil verse. He was doubtless a towering personality, to judge from the testimony of his pupil Dr. Swāminātha Iyer. The Christian poet, Kṛishṇa Piḷḷai, and the Muslim poet, Umaru Pulavar, were both accomplished versifiers. The former's *Rakshanya Yātrikam* and the latter's *Seera Purānam* are important period pieces. Another writer of the old school, V. P. Subramania Mudaliyār, died in 1946 at the venerable age of ninety.

His works include a Tamil version of *Paradise Lost.*, Book I, and the epyllion, *Akalikai Venba.*

The nineteenth century saw the publication of Dr. Caldwell's *A Comparative Grammar of the Dravidian Languages,* Anderson's *Rudiments of Tamil Grammar,* Winslow's *Tamil Dictionary,* and the first serious and popular Tamil periodicals. More and more classics were rescued from their obscure palm-leaf existence in *maṭhs* and given to the world. These early experiments in textual criticism culminated in the monumental labours and achievements of the late Mahāmahopādhyāya Dr. V. Swāminātha Iyer. He started his career at the Government College, Kumbakonam, succeeding the eminent Tamil Pandit, Tyāgarāja Chettiār. Towards the close of his long life he acted for a time as Professor of Tamil at the Annamalai University. His active period of scholarship and critical exegesis was about sixty-five years, and he died in 1942 at the ripe old age of eighty-seven. His enormous bibliography includes definitive editions of *Śilappadikāram, Maṇimēkhalai, Chintāmani, Puranānūru* and several other classics of the Śaṅgam age, a standard biography of his teacher Mīnākshisundaram Piḷḷai, a beautifully written candid autobiography, and innumerable essays and sketches. Teacher, editor, critic, biographer, master of a chaste but modern prose, humanist, Dr. Swāminātha Iyer was a hoary institution. He has rightly been described as "a scholar who was also a singer and a saint who found and diffused harmony throughout his life."[16] Among the numerous other scholars of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, the following deserve special and honourable mention: Professors Ranganātha Mudaliyār, Sundaram Piḷḷai, Śēshagiri Śāstrī, and Chēlvakesavarāya Mudaliyār; Pandits, M. and R. Rāghava Iyengar, Messrs. Sūryanārāyaṇa Śāstrī, Nallaswāmi Piḷḷai, and Kanakasabhai Piḷḷai.

Under the treble impact of missionary activity, English education, and renascent Bengal, Tamil literature quickened into new life in the last quarter of the nineteenth century and the opening decades of the present century. Vēdanāyakam Piḷḷai's *Pratāpa Mudaliyār Charitram* and B. R. Rājam Iyer's *Kamalāmbāl Charitram* were the first full-length novels in Tamil, and they are popular favourites even today half a century after their first publication. Vēdanāyakam Piḷḷai was a Tamil Christian, but his *Sarva Samarasa Kīrtanai* reveals his catholic spirit. The songs in the latter collection are sincere effusions, marked by simplicity and facility. Rājam Iyer was a precocious *yogī*, who edited the *Prabuddha Bhārata* when it was founded. His *Kamalāmbāl Charitram* is good as a story and is distinguished by its descriptions, humour, characterization and loving humanity. Rājam Iyer is one of the never-to-be-forgotten inheritors of unfulfilled renown in modern Tamil literature. Other pioneering efforts in fiction were Sūryanārāyaṇa Śāstrī's *Mativānan* Madhaviah's *Padmāvati* and Saravana Piḷḷai's *Mōhanāngi.*

In drama, Tamil writers of the last century first experimented with the epic and Puranic stories and turned them into dramas of a sort. Next came the phase of conscious imitation of Western models. Professor Sundaram Piḷḷai's *Manōnmanīyam* is a poetic drama in five acts, full of verbal felicities and packed with incidents. Romance, politics and intrigue go to make the interesting fabric of this drama and some of the characters at least—notably the heroine—are well delineated. Shakespeare's plays have been from time to time put into Tamil, but rarely have they been successful. Sūryanārāyaṇa Śāstrī's *Rūpavati, Kalāvati* and *Mānavijayam,* Pranathārtihara Śiva's *Damayanti,* and Sambanda Mudaliyār's *Manōhara, Amalāditya* (based on Hamlet) and *Golden Fetters* are good stage pieces. There are also compositions like *Nandanār Charitram* which are operatic in construction and appeal. It must be confessed, however, that no first rate dramatic artist has yet arrived in Tamil literature, although we have today any number of writers of successful or laughable one-act plays, melodramas or farces.

With the rising tempo of nationalism since the beginning of the twentieth century, there has been a great burst of Tamil poetry, and we have had a succession of inspired singers like Subramania Bhārati, Dēsigavināyakam Piḷḷai, Suddhānanda Bhārati, Bhārati Dāsan and Nāmakkal Rāmalingam Piḷḷai. Their literary career really belongs to the next period.

X. TELUGU

As narrated in the preceding Volume, the 18th century witnessed a considerable decline in Telugu literature. The major class of literature that flourished during the first half of the 19th century was poetry, particularly the Śatakas. They were large in number and showed a greater amount of originality, moral instruction, social element, human touch and spirit of lyricism than the other poetic forms. Phakki Veṇkaṭa Narasayya, Sītārāmāchārya, Subrahmaṇyakavi, Pārvatīswara Śāstrī, Bhagavatkavi, Dāsu Śrīrāmulu, Vasurāyalu and Chellapiḷḷa were some of the eminent Śataka writers of the time. There also flourished during this period a host of poetesses the most famous of whom was Veṅgamma.

The founder of modern Telugu literature was Rao Bahadur K. Vīrēśalingam. He was influenced by English literature and wrote his first novel, *Rājaśēkhara-charitramu,* whose theme was suggested by Goldsmith's *Vicar of Wakefield.* It was translated into English and favourably reviewed in the London *Times* in 1887. Vīrēśaliṅgam became a member of the Brāhma Samāj and wielded his vigorous pen in advocating social reforms and advanced ideas in all spheres of life. He was a versatile and prolific writer and broke many new grounds in Telugu literature. He wrote his autobiography, the first of its kind in Telugu literature, and was the author of a number of stories and fables for women and children. He conducted journals like *Vivēkavardhani* and his *Andhra Kavula-charitra* was the first fine attempt to write a history of the Telugu literature. He also paved the way for literary research and criticism and set up models for novel, drama, literary biography, journalism and essay on social and scientific subjects.

The drama of the modern type was evolved from older forms of play-writing like the Vidhināṭaka and the Yakshagāna. The age-long eminent Yakshagāna had almost developed into full-blown type of native drama by the time it made its debut in the 19th century. In the first half of this century the composition and the performance in many a different technique were in great vogue. The great Tyāgarāja, Melaṭṭūr Venkatarama Śāstrī and Sivāji, the last of the Marāṭhā royal line of Tanjore, in the south, and Tarigoṇḍa Veṅgamma, Sīrnāḍu Venkaṭarāyakavi and Pōḍuri Venkaṭarāju in the North were some of the important Yakshagāna authors of the time. The great votaries of the famous Kūchipūḍi school were putting on board Yakshagānas and winning the approbation of the man in the street and the prince in the palace alike. But in the latter part of the 19th century, the Dharwar Dramatic Company came into the scene. Telugu writers of the time were very much fascinated by their performances and took to writing plays on modern lines. Some made translations from Sanskrit and English and some tried their hand at new themes but adapted either the Sanskrit norms or the English in the technique of composition. Vīrēśaliṅgam did a pioneering work in this direction. His *Śākuntalam, Ratnāvali* and some farces were staged, won appreciation, and gave an impetus to others who wrote good dramas. Among these may be mentioned Chilakamarti Lakshmīnarasimham, another voluminous writer like Vīrēśaliṅgam, who wrote many dramas, novels, stories, essays and biographies. Two of his plays, *Prasannayādavam* and *Gayōpākhyānam,* and his two novels, *Hēmalatā* and *Karpūramañjari* became very popular. During the second half of the 19th century appeared a host of prose works dealing with moral fables, stories of pilgrimages, subjects like politics, law, and so on, which were useful to school children, housewives, the government institutions and so on. Chinnayasūri's *Nīti-*

chandrika won reputation as a classical specimen of modern Telugu prose in a very chaste and lucid style. Some have employed the colloquial style and satisfied the growing need of a vast majority of the reading public. As it gained momentum, the novel, the short story, the essay and the like, the essential form of which is prose, came into being. Vīrēśaliṅgam, the first novelist, is hailed as the father of modern prose literature in Telugu. Gurajāḍa Apparāo may be hailed as the father of modern short story in Telugu.

The *Bālavyākaraṇam* of Chinnayasūri, the *Prauḍha Vyākaraṇam* and the *Śabda-Ratnākaram* (dictionary) of Sītārāmāchārya, the lives of Telugu poets of Gurajāḍa Śrīrāmamūrtī, and *Amudrita-grandha Chintāmaṇi* of P. Rāmakṛishṇayya deserve special mention here as they are some of the rich products of this century.

Eminent services were rendered by the Europeans to the cause of Telugu literature during the first half of the nineteenth century. William Carey, A.D. Campbell, William Brown, C. P. Brown, Morris and Arden wrote Telugu grammars, mostly for the use of non-Telugu people. Campbell, Browns and Gelette published dictionaries. Bishop Caldwell paved the way for a systematic study of the Dravidian family of languages to which Telugu belongs, by the publication of his comparative grammar. Col. Mackenzie and C. P. Brown took pains in collecting manuscripts of old works. The Andhras are particularly indebted to C. P. Brown for the many-sided service he did for the Telugu Muse.

XI. KANNAḌA

The creation of the new Hindu State of Mysore at the beginning of the nineteenth century and the vicissitudes of fortune through which it passed during that century, have been described above.[16a] Mysore was naturally looked upon as the centre of Karṇāṭaka culture. Mummaḍi Kṛishṇarāja gathered round him Sanskrit and Kannaḍa scholars and himself composed numerous works in both these languages. About fifty works in Kannaḍa composed between 1815 and 1867, are ascribed to him. Of these seven are Sthalamāhātmyas and five are commentaries, mostly in Kannaḍa prose. Three works are based on the *Rāmāyaṇa,* six on the *Mahābhārata* and the *Bhāgavata,* and four on the Purāṇas. His prose version of the *Bhārata,* called *Vaṇīvilāsa Bhārata,* has attained some popularity. The stories of Śakuntalā, Nala, Hariśchandra, *Ratnāvalī, Daśakumāracharita, Uttara-Rāma-charita, Mālavikāgnimitra,* *Kādambarī,* and *Vikramorvaśīya* are based on the corresponding Sanskrit Kāvyas. Of the popular tales mention may be made of *Śuka-saptati, Vetālapañchaviṁśati* and *Battiś-Putthaḷi-kathā*. His devotion to the Dēvī is expressed in the translations of *Lalitōpākhyāna, Dēvīmāhāt-*

mya, Dēvīsāyujya, Sīsamālikā and *Dēvī Bhāgavata Tātparya Ṭīkā*. He also wrote commentaries on *Jātaka Sāmrājya* and *Bhārata Sāra Saṁgraha*.

During the fifty years of his active literary work Kṛishṇarāja patronised a number of scholars of all communities. Among the Jain authors were Śāntarāja Paṇḍita, Dēva Chandra, and Chārukīrtī Paṇḍita. Aḷiya Liṅga Rāja (1823-74) was an author in Kannaḍa and Sanskrit. His literary activity extended from about 1852 to 1867, and in a short period he produced more than fifty works in Kannaḍa. He employed many forms—Champū, Sāngatya, Shaṭpadi, Yakshagāna, Lāvaṇi and songs. His *Narapati-charita* is an Alaṁkāra work in the Champū style. *Prabhāvatī-pariṇaya* is in the Shaṭpadi metre. *Vīrabhadra-Śataka* is addressed to his favourite deity and the *Mahāliṅga Śataka* is didactic. Devatāpurada Nanjuṇḍa composed, besides stotras and śatakas, many eulogies of his patron, Mummaḍi Kṛishṇarāja. Kempu Nārāyaṇa's prose version of the *Mudrā-Rākshasa,* called *Mudrā-mañjūsha* had become popular. Among other writers patronised by Mummaḍi Kṛishṇarāja may be mentioned Venkaṭa Rāma Śāstrī Subrahmaṇya, Rangadāsa. Śrīnivāsa Tammayya, and Maddagiri Nanjappa who composed many works in praise of the ruler.

Outside this coterie of literati in Mysore which followed in style and subject matter the conventions of Sanskrit literature, a new movement was gathering strength as early as 1830. Kṛishṇamāchārya of Śrīraṅga Paṭṭana, Vakil of the Sadar Ādālat Court of Madras, wrote grammar and lexicons for both old and new Kannaḍa. His grammar of New Kannaḍa, *Hosagannaḍa Nuḍigannaḍi,* was printed in A.D. 1838 and is probably one of the earliest works in Kannaḍa to be printed. The influence of the Brāhma Samāj is found in the work of Rāma Brahmānanda Yōgi (c. 1840) whose *Bhaktisudhārasa* is written in the Bhaminī Shaṭpadi metre.

In the latter half of the nineteenth century the writers were inspired by the new movements in India and abroad. The missionaries of the Mangalore Basel Mission, the Wesley Mission, etc. were responsible for the printing and publication of a number of works. Reeve compiled an English-Kannaḍa dictionary and he and Sanderson issued a Kannaḍa-English lexicon. Carey, Karel, Zeigler, Maben, Campbell and Kittel wrote grammars of the Kannaḍa language. Kittel produced an excellent Kannaḍa-English dictionary with the help of many Paṇḍitas and edited *Śabdamaṇidarpaṇa*, and *Chhandombudhi*. Moegling nd Wiegle also printed *Basava Purāṇa, Chenna Basava Purāṇa, Rājendra Nāmā, Jaimini Bhārata,* the *Songs of the Dāsas*, etc. Rice, the famous epigraphist, edited Kannaḍa classics in the Bibliotheca Carnatica and complied a *Gazetteer*. He edited the *Amara-kōśa* in Kannaḍa, and his introductions to the classical works formed the basis for a more comprehensive history of the Kannaḍa language and literature.

Chāma Rāja Wodeyar (1881-1894) encouraged dramatic productions, but the theatre in Karṇāṭka rested on popular support. The first Kannaḍa drama to be staged was Basavappa Śāstrī's rendering of *Abhijñāna-Śākuntala,* which was so excellent that the Dewan, Rangāchārlu, conferred on the author the title of "Abhinava Kālidāsa". A number of dramas with original plots as well as those derived from Sanskrit and English came to be staged, and among the authors may be mentioned Basavappa Śāstrī, Moṭaganhaḷḷi Śaṁkara Śāstrī, Ayyā Śāstrī, N. Subba Śāstrī, and S. G. Narasiṁhāchārya. The stage-technique was also developed during the eighties.

The novel in Kannaḍa may be said to be due to B. Venkaṭāchārya, whose knowledge of Bengali enabled him to translate the masterpieces of Bankim-chandra Chatterji. He rendered the *Arabian Nights Entertainments, Tales of Rājasthān, Rasselas,* etc. into Kannaḍa and produced some original works also. The old type of narrative was followed by S. Venkateśa Śāstrī and others. Bālāchārya Sakkari (Śānti Kavi) wrote about seventy works, mostly in Shaṭpadi and Sāngatya. Nandaḷige Nāraṇappa also composed several works in old style.

XII. MALAYALAM

1. *The Age of Swathi Thirunal*

The literary and cultural history of Kerala during the period under review (1818-1905) has to be viewed against the background of its political condition at the close of the previous century. Though divided into three distinct political units, viz. Travancore, Cochin and Malabar, Kerala remained a single cultural unit. The British supremacy had become another common binding factor, Tranvancore and Cochin having already come under the British power by treaty obligations, and Malabar having been merged in the Madras Presidency. All the three political units had begun to be influenced by the new system of administration established by the British in India.

An era favourable to the growth of literary and cultural activity dawned on the country under these changes, which were more or less similar in nature to those observed in other parts of India during the same period, with the difference that owing to the intense interest taken by the rulers of Travancore and Cochin in the spread of education on Western lines and in the adoption of British methods of administration, the new orientation of culture got a greater impetus in these States.

The period that followed may rightly be called the age of Swathi Thirunal (Mahārājā of Tranvancore, 1829-1847), as regards literature and other arts. He was indeed the most remarkable person in Kerala at that time. A great scholar in several Indian languages, he tried his hand at poetic and musical compositions in not less than seven of them, viz., Malayālam, Sanskrit, Tamil, Telugu, Hindī Urdu and Marāṭhī. He was an inspired devotional poet. His learning in English, a rare accomplishment in those days, received the warm eulogy of Europeans. Learned men from all parts of India flocked to his court to display their talents and earn their rewards. It was the age of Thyagarāja, Muthuswāmi Dikshithar and Syāma Śāstrī in South Indian Music, and the Mahārājā, being as splendid and talented a singer and composer as any of them, attracted to his court many of the prominent musicians of the time.

As regards literature, the leading figures were Irayimman Thampi and Vidwan Koithampuran, both court poets of Swathi Thirunal. They can truly be termed representatives of the trends of the times, since their works abound in a beautiful and happy blending of poetry and music. Irayimman Thampi is pre-eminently the most musical of the poets of Kerala, and his beautiful lullaby commencing with the line *Ōmaṇa Ttiṅkaḷkitāvō* has earned for him an everlasting name. His musical compositions, mainly of a devotional nature, with their sweet literary flavour, are still widely sung in Kerala. But his chief title to the high position he holds in Malayālam is the singular contribution he has made to the Kathakali literature by his three works, the *Dakshayāgam, Kīchakavadham,* and *Uttarā-svayamvaram.*

Vidwan Koithampuran, also, was a remarkable poet much liked by the Mahārājā. He died very young, but his Kathakali work, *Rāvaṇa Vijayam,* has made him immortal in literature. Next to Unnai Varier and Irayimman Thampi, he is perhaps the best of the Kathakali writers who had in them a true dramatic sense and genius for characterisation.

2. *Impact of English Education.*

The spread of English education sponsored by the British administrative system had very soon its impact on Malayālam literature. Here also special mention has to be made of the role of Swathi Thirunal and his successor, Uthram Thirunal (1847-61), Mahārājās of Tranvancore, in the encouragement of English education in that State, as evidenced by the policy of starting schools in important centres, and the assistance given to the Church Mission and the London Mission Societies in their efforts to start educational institutions. Missionaries who showed interest in literary and linguistic studies were encouraged by the Mahārājās.

The progress of literature in the Cochin and Malabar areas during the period was also very much influenced by the advancement of English education in those regions. Mahārājās of Cochin were great patrons of the new system of education, and Malabar, being directly under the British administration, took rapid steps in the new advancement. The educational activities of the Christian missionaries belonging to the Basel Mission deserve special mention. It was under their auspices that Dr. Gundert, a German missionary of exceptional linguistic talents, produced by his own personal effort the *Malayālam-English Dictionary* which even today remains an authoritative work.

3. *Prose Literature*

The establishment of the Madras University (1857), which embraced the Kerala region also, marks an important event in the cultural history of Kerala. It is from the products of this University that a generation of scholars, well versed in Western literature and with a capacity to enrich their own language by adopting Western literary trends, came into being. Prose was the first branch to receive an impetus by the contact with English. Though there was no paucity of prose in Malayālam even in olden times, it had not developed on modern lines until the writers became familiar with the Western modes of prose-writing such as the essay, the novel, the short story and literary criticism. The earliest experiments in modern prose composition were more or less in the form of conscious efforts necessitated by the requirement of textbooks in Malayālam. It was left to the far-sighted policy of Ayilliyam Thirunal, Mahārājā of Travancore (1861-1880), to start a scheme for the preparation of textbooks for use in schools in the State. Kerala Varma Valiakoithampuran, an erudite scholar in Sanskrit, Malayālam, and English and an eminent poet, was appointed the Chairman of the Committee formed to prepare the textbooks.

Kerala Varma's prose was modelled on that of some of the best English essayists and his experiments in prose-writing set a good example to be followed by contemporary writers in Malayālam. He wrote several books suited for various standards in the newly established schools. The Mahārājā and the heir apparent, Visakham Tirunal, also, were prose writers of no mean ability, and, besides encouraging other writers, they themselves contributed to the advancement of modern Malayālam prose. It was at the instance of the latter that Kerala Varma translated Maunder's *Treasury of Biography* and a novel named *Akbar* which was a translation of the English version of a Dutch novel of the same name.

The growth of journalism helped in no small measure the development of prose. Initiated by Christian missionaries for the purpose of religious propaganda, journalism was taken up later by local scholars who started newspapers and journals for literary and political activities. Some of the journals were solely devoted to literature, whilst the newspapers set apart special columns for literary articles, reviews and poems. These publications served to create literary interest among the common man and to encourage talented persons to cultivate their literary faculties.

4. *The Novels.*

Another aspect of the new era in literature was the rise of the novel. Appu Nedungadi, an early graduate of the newly started Madras University, published his *Kundalatā* in the year 1887. Though the work cannot be said to have satisfied the standards of a novel, it still marks the origin of prose fiction in Malayālam. Soon after this, two other talented writers appeared in the field and contributed some of the most outstanding novels in Malayālam. Chandu Menon, the author of *Indulekhā*, a great social novel (1889), was the first of them, and C. V. Raman Piḷḷai, who wrote his *Mārttāndavarma*, a historical novel (1890), the second. Both the works became very popular and soon there was an influx of writers who wrote after the models set by these veterans. But excepting only a few, the works produced were unsuccessful imitations. Later on, Chandu Menon himself wrote another social novel, by name *Sārada*, but could not finish it before his premature death. With these two outstanding works, Chandu Menon has won a permanent place in the history of Malayālam fiction. Though C. V. Raman Piḷḷai remained silent for some time after producing his *Mārttāndavarma*, at a later period he distinguished himself by writing works like *Dharmarāja* and *Rāmarāja Bahadūr*, which hold their place as the most outstanding historical novels in Malayālam.

5. *Drama and Poetry.*

As regards poetry there were two main trends—one represented by the Venmani Nampoodiris (the Senior and the Junior), and the other by Kerala Varma. Kerala Varma's poetry was modelled on the old *Maṇipravāḷa* style abounding in Sanskrit words and terms, but it had a charm of its own when adapted to express new ideas in a masterly way characteristic of himself. His translation of Kālidāsa's *Śākuntalam* (1882) marks an important event in the history not only of Malayālam drama but of poetry as well. There was an overflow of translations and original dramas following the appearance of that work, the most notable of the translations being that of Bhavabhūti's *Uttara-Rāma-charitam* by Chathukkutty Mannadiyar.

Kerala Varma's *Mayūra-sandeśam* was his second important contribution to Malayālam poetry. It is a Sandeśakāvya (messenger poem) written after Kālidāsa's *Meghadūtam*. Though it cannot compare favourably with its model in Sanskrit in poetic excellence, and though written in the *Maṇipṛavāḷa* style, it has to be admitted that *Mayūra-sandeśam* is one of the most popularly acclaimed poems in Malayālam. This may be due to the bearing it has on the eventful life of its author and the sense of reality that pervades it, mingled with the music of its diction.

Venmani Nampoodiris, on the other hand, were upholders of the pure Malayālam style, which in the course of its chequered history had suffered serious set-backs at the hands of Sanskrit poets and scholars. The Junior Venmani's *Pūraprabandham,* a descriptive poem on the famous temple festival at Trichur, and other works, including a large number of individual stanzas, abound in wit and humour, though some of them are ultra-erotic. These were very much liked by readers, both common and scholarly, thanks to their directness of appeal, simplicity of manner and melody of diction. The Venmanis got a large number of followers as regards their style, especially from among the famous poets belonging to the Kodungalloor royal family, like Kunju Kuttan Thampuran, Kochunni Thampuran and a good number of their disciples.

Closely following the above trend, came the dawn of a new romantic school of poetry in Malayālam sponsored by scholars who had come under the influence of similar trends in English poetry. A. R. Rāja Rāja Varma, the famous Professor of Malayālam in the Mahārājā's College, Trivandrum, gave the lead to the new movement. A critic and a poet himself, he emphasized the greater importance of sentiments in poetry compared to mere form, and he initiated a controversy opposing the school of writers who advocated the pseudo-classical model. He attacked the tendency of the poets in general to give undue importance to what is called *Dvitīyākshara Prāsa* (uniformity in sound in the second syllable in all the four lines of a stanza). He also opposed the predominance of Sanskrit words in Malayālam verse. He did not mind that he was thereby attacking his *guru* and uncle, Kerala Varma, who happened to be the leading upholder of the old school. Rāja Rāja Varma's example inspired younger poets like Kumaran Asan and Vallathol, and helped the speedy development of the new romantic poetry.

But the classical tendency of the poets persisted for some time more, as a result of which several poets took it as a fashion to write Mahākāvyas after some of the famous classical works of that category in Sanskrit. Azhakathu Padmanābha Kurup paved the way by his *Rāmachandra-vilāsam* and others followed suit. Some of the well-known Mahākāvyas that originated at this time were *Chitrayōgam* of Vallathol, *Umākeraḷam* of Ulloor, *Rugmaṅgada-charitam* of Pandalam Kerala Varma and *Kesavīyam* of K. C. Kesava Pillai. The last-mentioned work is of particular interest since its author, being a faithful follower of A. R. Rāja Rāja, made some deviations in the manner of the work by abandoning the artificialities of sound and play on words indulged in by the authors of Mahākāvyas in general, and attaching greater importance to suggestiveness of meaning and sincerity of sentiments, characteristic of the Romantic school.

6. *Literary Criticism.*

Mention has to be made of the origin of literary criticism in Malayālam which also was the outcome of the contact of Malayālam scholars with the trends in English literary criticism. Some of the earliest essayists like C. P. Achutha Menon set the model by means of book-reviews in journals. But it was left to A. R. Rāja Rāja Varma to establish certain standards in the field through his *Sāhityasāhyam,* a treatise on rhetoric, and his famous introduction to *Nalacharitam* kathakali. Subsequent critics like P. K. Nārāyaṇa Piḷḷai, who can be said to have laid the foundation of scholarly criticism in Malayālam, owed much to the precepts of their veteran Professor A. R. Rāja Rāja. The personal essay was also developing in Malayālam, though there were only a very few essayists in the strict sense of the word. The most important of them was Kunju Raman Nayanar, popularly know by his pseudonym, 'Kēsari'. Moorkothu Kumaran, K. Sukumaran and a few others also wrote lighter essays with a certain amount of success. Among writers of serious essays in that period, the names of Appan Thampuran, K. R. Krishna Pillai and M. Rāja Rāja Varma deserve special mention.

7. *Translations.*

One of the notable features of the early decades of the 20th century was the great interest taken by writers to translate works from Sanskrit and English into Malayālam. Dewan Bahadur A.

Govinda Piḷḷai translated several of Shakespeare's dramas, using a sort of blank verse in Malayālam. But he had very few followers in the line. As regards purely poetic works, the translation of Kālidāsa's *Meghadūta* and *Kumārasambhava* by A. R. Rāja Rāja and of *Raghuvaṁśa* by Kundoor Nārāyaṇa Menon have to be mentioned. Translations of prose works from English also had increased in number after Kerala Varma's *Akbar* and other translations. One of the most successful of the later translators was C. S. Subramanian Potti who set a good model by his translation of *Durgeśanandinī* of Bankim-chandra from an English version of it.

XIII. INDIAN CONTRIBUTION TO ARABIC LITERATURE.

Arabic, as the original language of the *Qur'ān* and the Islamic sciences, continued to attract the attention of the Indian Muslims during the 19th century, and was widely studied throughout the country. The main purpose, however, of acquiring a respectable knowledge of this language was to get acquainted with the religious texts, rather than to cultivate a real taste for its literature. The result was that several important branches of Arabic literature, especially *belles-lettres* and poetry, were neglected, and India failed to produce any eminent Arabic poet or litterateur during this period, as indeed in the previous centuries, with the solitary exception, perhaps, of Ghulam Ali Azad of Bilgram (d. 1785).[18] The well-known Dars-i-Nizami, to which we have referred elsewhere, for instance, contained very little of proper literature, while laying unnecessary emphasis on grammar and rhetoric, and whatever of such literature was included in the curricula of the various madrasas, was confined to a few standard works, such as the *Mu'allaqāt*,[19] the *Hamāsa* and the *Maqāmāt*[20] of Badi'uz-Zamān and al-Harīrī. Under the circumstances one could hardly expect the Indian scholars of Arabic to have a true literary flair for Arabic or to be capable of writing any original work of outstanding merit. The attention, therefore, of these scholars was focussed on the Qur'ānic exegeses (*Tafsir*), the Apostolic Traditions (*Hadis*), jurisprudence (*Fiqh*), the sources of the Islamic law (*Usūl fiqh*), dogmatic theology (*Kalām*), and, to a lesser degree, on the allied or subsidiary sciences of Sūfism (*tasawwuf*), grammar and logic. But even in these branches their main output was of secondary importance, consisting mostly of commentaries and glosses on works by Arab authors, or small, unpretentious tracts on particular topics of chiefly theological interest.

Among the scholars who distinguished themselves in their respective fields of study during the period, we may specially mention the two brothers, Shāh 'Abd'ul 'Aziz (d. 1828) and Shāh Rafi'uddin (d. 1233 H. = 1817-18 A.D.), sons of Shāh Wali'ullah, the famous scholar and religious reformer of the preceding century. The former has left a work entitled *Muqaddama Tafsir Fath al-'Aziz* on Qur'ānic exegesis, another on apocryphal traditions (*al-Ahādis al Mauzū'a*), and several others dealing with different topics such as philology, Sūfism and dogmatic theology. His work, the *Sirr'ul Shahādatain*, on the martyrdom of the Prophet's grandsons, the Imāms Hasan and Husain, has won wide recognition, and so has a collection of his letters, *al-Makātīb*. Shāh Rafi'uddin has written a masterly exposition of a Qur'ānic verse, *Āyat al-Nūr*, besides several works of a literary character, such as the collection of his letters *(Ruqqa'āt)* and clever interpolations *(tazmīnāt)* of certain standard Arabic poems. The family tradition of Arabic scholarship was likewise maintained by the two grandsons of Shāh Wali'ullāh, namely Qāzi Muhammad Ismā'il (d. 1830) and Abū Sulaimān Muhammad Ishāq (d. 1844), both of whom wrote well-known works on *Hadis, Kalām,* etc.

Another notable scholar of the period was Abū 'Abd'ullah Husain bin Dildār 'Ali (d. 1854) of Nasirabad, whose father, Dildār 'Ali (d. 1819)[21], had the distinction of being the first Indian-born Shi'a Mujtahid, and who has written a fairly large number of well-known works on Qur'ānic exegeses, jurisprudence, dogmatic theology and philosophy, while a contemporary of his, Mohammad Ghaus Sharf'ul Mulk bin Nizāmuddin Ahmad (d. 1822), is remembered for his two literary works of considerable merit, i.e. a commentary of the famous ode *Bānat Su'ad* by Ka'b bin Zuhair, a longish poem delineating the titles of the fourth Orthodox Caliph, 'Ali (*Urjūza fi Alqāb Hazrat 'Ali*). He, incidentally, belonged to the Nawāi't (sing: Nauti)[22] community, a family of Arab emigrants settled in Southern India. We may also mention here a Hindu scholar of Delhi, Munshi Kundan Lal (d. 1822), who wrote Persian poetry with the pen-name (*takhallus*) Ashki. He was the son of Munshi Munwan Lal, known as al-Falsafi (the Philosopher), and belonged to a Hindu family domiciled in Delhi which had maintained a tradition of Arabic and Persian learning from the days of Emperor Shāhjāhān. A copy of his work, *al-Qistās,* on mathematics, is preserved in the Bankipur Library.[23] The only Arabic poet of this period, who is said to have left behind a *diwān* (collection) of his poems, was Faiz Ahmad bin Hāfiz Ghulām Ahmad of Badaun who died in 1857.

Khairabad, a town near Lakhnau and the home of several distinguished scholars and poets of the 18th and 19th centuries, produced during this period the well-known scholar Muhammad Fazl-i-

Haqq (d. 1861), son of Fazl-i-Imām,[24] who wrote several works, including one on *tasawwuf*, entitled *Al-Rauz al Majūd fi Thaqiq al- Wujud* (The well-watered Garden about the ascertainment of Existence), and a short Arabic history of the Mutiny of 1857, entitled *Risāla-i-Tār'ikh al-Ghadr*. One of his Arabic poems, a panegyric on the Prophet, is also well-known. He was accused of treason after the Mutiny and was sent to the Andaman Islands, where he died. Farangi Mahal of Lakhnau, another important centre of learning, found an able representative in the person of Wali'ullāh bin Habibullah (d. 1853), among whose literary products is a work of history entitled *al-Aghsān ad-Arba'a* (The Four Branches) comprising an account of the first four Orthodox Caliphs, the immediate successors of the Prophet. A colleague of his, Khādim Ahmad, son of Mulla Haider (d. 1854), wrote notes (*ta'liqāt*) on the well-known work on jurisprudence, *Sharah al-Waqaya*. Mention should also be made of Shaikh Muhammad bin Ahmad Ali al-Zabīdi (d. 1841); though he lived for the greater part of his life at Zabid in Yemen, whence his place-name (*nisba*), he was born in Sind and was of Indian origin. He was sent to Egypt as his ambassador by the Imām of San'ā and passed the last days of his life in Medina where he held the onerous post of chief theologian. He is the author of numerous works, chiefly concerned with apostolic traditions (*hadis*), of which the most notable, perhaps, are a collection of "solitary" *hadis* entitled *Hasr al-Shārid* and a concordance of the *Musnad* of Abū Hanifa.

Most of the authors to whom we have referred above belong to the pre-Mutiny period of the 19th century, but it must not be supposed that the tradition of Arabic scholarship suffered any serious set-back after that epoch. The fifty years that followed were, on the other hand, marked by literary activity on even a larger scale, and produced several great scholars. Their work, however, has not yet been properly appraised and in many cases remains unpublished. Yet a brief mention of some of them is necessary here. The most outstanding among these was undoubtedly Maulavi Abdu'l Hayy of Lakhnau (d. 1886) who wrote three important works, namely a *tafsir* of the Qur'ān entitled *al-Tuhfat al-Mukhtāriya*, a voluminous work based on practically all the standard commentaries compiled before his time; a collection of his lectures, *Jami' Khutub Shuhūr al-Sana*, delivered on Fridays during the course of a year, which are in a highly ornate style and have been compared to the *Atwāq al-Zahab* of al-Zamakhshari,[25] and lastly a comprehensive biography (*tazkira*) of the great poets and scholars of modern times, entitled *Nuzhat al-Khawātir*. This last work, which is in several volumes and is being published at Lakhnau, is a most valuable supplement to the *Subhat al-Marjān* and *Sarw-i-Azād* of Ghulam 'Ali Azād Bilgrami. Nawab Razā Hasan Khan, son of the Persian poet, Nawab Amin Hasan Khan of Kakori (d. 1846-7), was likewise a good scholar of Arabic who wrote poetry in that language, with great facility. He is said to have composed a long ode (316 verses) in a single night. This ode which he named *Lāmiyat al-Hind* after the famous *Lāmiyat al-'Arab* of al Shanfara, has been highly appreciated by literary critics, and has enjoyed wide celebrity. Another Arabic poet who is better known for his scholarly works in several other branches of literature, was Maulavi 'Ali 'Abbas of Chirayyakot (d. 1302 H. =1884-5 A.D.), who lived for a considerable time in Hyderabad and Bhopal and was patronized by Nawab Sikandar Jahan Begum. He counted among his pupils several distinguished scholars, including Maulavi Faiz'ul Hasan of Saharanpur (d. 1304 H. = 1886-7), who has left behind a whole *diwan* of Arabic verses. But the most notable scholar-poet of the post-Mutiny period was certainly Mufti Syed Muhammad 'Abbās of Lakhnau (d. 1306 H. = 1888-9), who composed numerous poems in Arabic as well as in Persian. He had served in his earlier career under the kings of Avadh, Muhammad 'Ali and Amjad 'Ali, and visited Calcutta twice while Wājid 'Ali Shāh was there. Among his Arabic poems, there is a satire on Calcutta, a city which he never liked, while one of his Persian poems, a *Masnawi*, entitled *Mann wa Salwā* written in a didactic strain, found recognition even outside India, notably in Irāq where a prominent *mujtahid* was so struck by the Mufti's erudition that he composed an ode in his praise and sent it to him along with a very flattering letter.

XIV. INDIAN CONTRIBUTION TO PERSIAN LITERATURE.

Unlike Arabic, Persian lost a good deal of its former popularity during this period. This was partly due to the fact that with the secession of the trans-border areas of Kabul and Kandahār from the Mughul empire, fresh waves of immigrants, speaking Persian, had ceased to flow into the country, and partly to the development of Urdu as the common language of social intercourse and literary compositions. The result was that Persian had ceased to be the *lingua franca* of the educated classes long before 1818, although it continued to be the official language till 1834. Unlike Arabic, again, Persian had very little religious or sentimental appeal for the Indian Muslims, as the only interest it had aroused among them even in the preceding centuries was mainly literary and cultural. An elementary knowledge of Persian continued, no doubt, to be a necessary part of their early education almost throughout the 19th century, but the old tradition of a real mastery of the language and a deep acquaintance with its classical literature had been fading away very fast. It did not, moreover, find a place in the regular curricula of most of the educational institutions of quasi-religious character founded about this time, such as the Dārul-'Ulūm of Deoband or the Nadwaṭ al-'Ulama of Lakhnau, so that with its gradual replacement by Urdu in the Muslim homes as the usual medium of conversation, opportunities for its study became fewer and fewer. All this explains why we do not find in this period any eminent poet or scholar of Persian who could be placed in the same rank with the stalwarts of the earlier periods like, for instance, Amīr Khusrav, Syed Hasan and Faizī among the poets, or Baranī, Firishta, Badāunī and Abu'l-Fazl among the prose-writers.

The only Persian poet of real merit in the period under review was Mirza Asadullah Khān Ghālib of Delhi (d. 1869). Famous nowadays chiefly on account of his remarkably original Urdu poetry, he has left behind a fairly large collection of his Persian poems, mostly in the form of odes (*Qasidas*) and lyrics (*Ghazals*), of very considerable literary excellence, which certainly deserve much more attention than they have received so far.[26] Having studied Persian under the supervision of a competent Iranian scholar, he acquired wonderful proficiency in that language and a refined taste for its poetry. He was a great admirer of Bedil, 'Urfi and Naziri and tried to imitate their style, but several of his odes are replicas of those composed by the earlier masters, like Anwari and Khāqani, and compare very favourably with them. Some of his prose works have also survived him and are very well-known. One of these, entitled *Qāti'-i-Burhān*, is a thoughtful criticism of the Persian lexicon, *Burhān-i-Qāti*, compiled by Muhammad Husain "Burhān", which invited rejoinders from his opponents in the form of *Sāti'-i Burhān* etc., and excited a lot of controversy in contemporary literary circles. Another work, named *Panj Āhang*, written in an ornate style, illustrates five different styles of Persian composition; the *Dastanbū* contains an account of the Mutiny and the *Mihr-i-Nīmrūz* is an incomplete history of the Mughul empire, while his Urdu letters, which have been edited by several scholars in recent times, are fine specimens of a simple and straightforward literary style, apart from their biographical and historical value as records of several contemporary events connected with the poet himself or his friends and acquaintances.[27]

Among other Persian poets of this period, mention may be made of Nawab Mustafa Khān Shīfta, a pupil of Ghālib's and Qatil and Shifā'i, his rivals. Mirzā Qatīl, originally a Hindu (Khatri) of Faridabad, enjoyed considerable celebrity in his time and had many pupils, including Mirzā Khān, the Kotwāl of Delhi. Ghālib himself had several other talented pupils, including Munshi Hargopāl "Tufta",[28] who had collected a *diwan* of his odes and lyrics, Mir Mahdi "Majrūh", and Nawab Ziyā'uddīn "Naiyar" of the Loharu family. Mufti Sadruddīn of Delhi (d. 1285 H.=1868-9) was a learned scholar of Kashmiri origin who also distinguished himself in Persian poetry, while Mufti Syed Muhammad 'Abbās of Lakhnau (d. 1306 H.=1888-9 A.D.) has left behind numerous Persian poems, one of which entitled *Mann-o-Salwā*, has been referred to in the preceding section.

The younger generation of poets who died early in the 20th century, but achieved considerable fame by the end of the 19th, included Shiblī Nu'māni, a scholar of versatile talents and the real founder of the Nadwat'ul 'Ulama, who wrote with equal facility in Persian and Urdu, and Girāmi of Jullandhar in the Panjāb. The latter, of whose poetical talents Iqbāl had a very high opinion, attached himself to the Nizam of Hyderabad, Deccan, Mīr Osmān 'Ali Khān (who, incidentally, is himself a good poet), and became his *Ustād* (teacher in the art of poetry). Mention may also be made of Nawab Amīr Hasan Khān of Kakori (d. 1263 H.=1846-7 A.D.) who wrote elegant Persian poetry under the pen-name of "Bismil".

Another branch of Persian literature which attracted the attention of Indian writers was religious and Sūfīstic studies, and numerous works on this topic appeared during the period under review. Among the authors of such works was Hāji Imdād 'Ali of Thana Bhawan, who migrated to Mecca in the Hijaz after the Mutiny and died there in 1899. Included among his pupils were well-known scholars like Maulana Muhammad Qasim of Nānauta, Maulana Faizul Hasan of Saharanpur, and Maulavi Rashid Ahmad of Gangoh, and he is the author of three popular works entitled the *Ghizā-i-Rūh, Ziyā'ul Qulūb,* and *Tufat'ul 'Ushshāq.*[29] Mention may also be made of a Jaunpur scholar and reformer, Maulavi Karāmat 'Alī (d. 1873), who lived for the greater part of his life in Bengal and was the author of several works, including Persian translations of the Arabic works, *Shamā'l-Tirmizī* and the *Mishkāt al-Masābīh.*

Persian lexicography had continued to attract Indian scholars from the days of Sikandar Lodī onwards, and a number of lexicons, such as the *Farhang-i-Rashīdi* and *Farhang-i-Jahāngiri*, became well-known in India and Iran. The old tradition was fully maintained during the nineteenth century and several works of conspicuous merit were produced. Of these the best-known is the *Ghayas al-Lughāt* by Muhammad Ghayāsuddīn of Rampur, compiled in 1242 H. (=1826-7 A.D.), but the *Burhān-i-Qāti'*, to which we have referred above, the *Bahār-i-'Ajam* by Munshi Tek Chand "Bahār' the *Sirāj al-Lughāt* by Sirājuddīn 'Ali Khan "Ārzū", the *Karīm al-Lughāt* by Munshi Karimuddīn, and the *Lughāt-i-Kishorī,* named after Munshi Newal Kishore and compiled by Maulavi Tasadduq Hussain, have also been quite popular.

XV. URDU

The origin of the literary language, now known as Urdu, in the eighteenth century, from the local dialect of Delhi has been described in the Eighth Volume. "Urdu poetry, up to the fourth quarter of the 19th century, was just a reflex of Persian poetry. Nothing in it but a few common words, inflexions, postpositions and verbs were Hindī. The Urdu poets thought and wrote in terms of Persian poetry; the references were to things and events and ideas of Persia and Arabia; they use names of all Persian flowers, all the little streams of Persia, and its towns and provinces and its hills and mountains, but they never mention an Indian flower or an Indian river or mountain or town, much less an Indian hero or heroine. It was an absolute and deliberate shutting of their eyes and ears and mind to all the great things of their own country, the soil of which, according to a great Urdu poet, was *nāpāk* or impure."[30]

Muhammad Nazīr of Agra (1740-1830) was a remarkable Urdu poet, who composed his poems not on the conventional Sūfī or Persian themes, nor on love treated in the conventional way of Persian poetry, but on all sorts of subjects relating to Indian life in a racy colloquial language, not too much Persianized, which is also the language of the Hindus. He treated Hindu themes, like Kṛishṇa's childhood, and his *Banjāra-nāma,* a poem on the transitoriness of things, and his *Ādmī-nāma* on 'Man', essentially great in his dignity, are great poems.

Among other 19th century Urdu poets may be mentioned Haidar 'Alī Ātish (d. 1846), Imām Baksh Nāsikh (d. 1836), Salāmat 'Alī Dabīr (1803-1875), and Babar 'Alī Anīs (1802-1874). Many of them were prolific writers, the last-named producing nearly a hundred-thousand lines.

Lakhnau and Rampur became great centres of Urdu literature in the nineteenth century. Among the great poets of the pre-modern period may be mentioned Muhammad Ibrāhim Zauq (1789-1894), Asadullāh Khān Ghālib (1806-1869), Muhammad Mu'min Khān Mu'min (1800-1850), Amīr Ahmad Mīnāī (1828-1900), and Nawāb Mirzā Khān Dāgh (1831-1905). Ghālib, the most eminent among these, was a Sūfī and a mystic who wrote in both Persian and Urdu and inaugurated literary history and criticism through his letters. He is generally regarded as the greatest poet of Urdu before the modern age because of his human sympathies and his Sūfī feel for the ultimate Reality. Zauq was famous for his *Qasidās,* and he was only a little less eminent than Ghālib.

The Aligarh Movement, inaugurated by Sir Syed Ahmad, which will be discussed in detail in Ch. VIII gave rise to the Modern Urdu literature at the beginning of the fourth quarter of the 19th century. Sir Syed's great contribution to this literature was his letters and his historical work *Asaru-s-Sanadia.* The Aligarh Movement made the Indian Muslims more and more conscious of their Islamic rather than Indian heritage, and instilled in them the ideal of pan-Islamism. All this was reflected in the modern Urdu literature. A number of Muslim Urdu prose-writers of eminence—historians and essayists—came to the front. Among them may be mentioned Maulavī Zakāullāh, Shiblī Nu'mānī (historian and essayist) Muhammad Husain Āzād, Maulavī Nazīr Ahmad (novelist), and above all, Altaf Hosain Pānipatī, known as Hālī or the Modern One (1837-1914), the great poet of this Muslim revival and the innovator of the modern spirit in Urdu poetry. These writers are all marked by a human spirit. Nazīr Ahmad's sketches of Delhi Muslim life in his novels are delightful and Hālī wrote with a breadth of vision and sympathy which did not exclude the Hindus.

There were several eminent Hindu writers of Urdu. The most important among them is Paṇḍit Ratannāth Sarshār whose book, *Fisāna-e-Azād,* gives a wonderfully vivid and realistic sketch of the social life of Lakhnau.

Muslim Urdu writers wrote historical novels, in imitation of those of Sir Walter Scott. The best known are two novels of Maulavi 'Abdul Hālim Sharar, namely *Azīz-o-Warjina* (Virginia), which is a tale of the crusades, and *Mansūr-o-Mohanā,* which has the conquests of Sultān Muhmūd of Ghaznī in Gujarāt as its background.

An outstanding Hindu poet of Urdu was Brij Nārāin Chakbast (1882-1926), who was a Kashmiri Brāhman. His poems are full of the spirit of nationalism, and his diction is remarkably simple and pure.

The present age of Urdu is dominated by the spirit of Sir Muhammad Iqbāl (1873-1938) whose works will be discussed in the next volume.

XVI. INDO-ANGLIAN LITERATURE.

Indo-Anglian literature is a significant and fruitful by-product of the Western impact on Indian culture. The East inspired men like William Jones, Monier Williams, Max Müller, Edwin Arnold, and Anthony Hope, and the result was a very interesting and still growing body of Anglo-Indian literature. Likewise, the West and its literature exerted no mean influence on the educated Indians of the nineteenth century, and some of them successfully braved the dangers of attempting creative literature in a foreign medium; and there resulted the singular phenomenon of 'Indo-Anglian literature', in other words, Indians' writing in English.

Reference has been made above, in Chapter II, to the beginnings of English education. Having got the "blessings" of English education, the educated Indians were for a time flushed with excitement and habitually conversed and wrote in English. While "Babu" and "butler" English came for ridicule, there was, on the other hand, the amazing phenomenon of hundreds and thousands of Indians wielding this most difficult of alien languages with vigour, self-confidence and uncanny efficiency. Indian lawyers, judges and administrators, journalists, professors and publicists, soon found themselves reasonably at home in English, and thereby created conditions favourable to the birth and growth of authentic Indo-Anglian literature.

Rāmmohan Roy was himself an effective writer of English prose, as may be seen from his pamphlets and philosophical essays, published over century ago. Kāśī-prasād Ghose's[31] *The Shair and Other Poems* was published in 1831. Henry Derozio[32] was a more genuine poet, and when he died at a young age in 1831, he left behind him a creditable body of verses in English, including the narrative poem, *The Fakir of Jungheera*. But, of course, Indo-Anglian poetry begins properly with Michael Madhu-sūdan Dutt, Aru Dutt, Toru Dutt, and Romesh Chunder Dutt. Michael Madhu-sūdan[33] belongs more to Bengali than to Indo-Anglian literature, though his *Captive Ladie* is a brisk narrative poem on Prithvīrāj and Saṁyuktā. Aru Dutt and Toru Dutt were a marvellous pair of sisters who died, in 1874, at the ages of twenty and twenty-one respectively. Both were poetesses of rare promise and no mean achievement, and both of them were among the winged fairies of song. Their English renderings of French lyrics of the Romantic school came out in 1876 with the title *A Sheaf Gleaned in French Fields*. The pieces were so felicitous and moving that Edmund Gosse thought that "if modern French literature were entirely lost, it might not be found impossible to reconstruct a great number of poems from this Indian version." Toru Dutt's *Ancient Ballads and Legends of Hindustan* appeared posthumously in 1882, and more than ever proved Toru's unique powers of poetic utterance in a foreign medium. More than eighty years have passed since Toru's poems were first given to the world—since the agitated girl made the amazing confession:

From my lips broke a cry,
Such as anguish may wring;
Sing—said God in reply,
Chant, poor little thing.

But the fragrance of Toru's poems is not lost yet, nor will it ever be. "This child of the green valley of the Ganges" (in Mr. H. A. L. Fisher's words) is likely to retain her present place "in the great fellowship of English poets." Romesh Chunder Dutt had a distinguished career as a member of the Indian Civil Service, and published valuable treatises on the economic history of India. But his novel, *The Lake of Palms,* and his *Rāmāyaṇa and Mahābhārata in English Verse* secure him a permanent place in Indo-Anglian literature. The latter work has been found rightly worthy of inclusion in the 'Everyman's Library' of the World's Best Books.

The brothers, Manmohan and Aurobindo Ghose, started writing English poetry towards the close of the nineteenth century. Manmohan published, along with Laurence Binyon and others, a volume of poems entitled *Primavera* in 1890. After his return to India, he published *Love Songs and Elegies* and *Songs of Love and Death.* Manmohan was undoubtedly a born poet with an utterance all his own. His mature poetry is full of intimate and memorable touches, and there is generally a colouring of pensive sadness that becomes more and more pronounced in his later poems. Manmohan's poems sound English to the core, and it is not surprising, therefore, that Mr. George Sampson describes him as "the most remarkable of the Indian poets who wrote in English." Manmohan's younger brother, Aurobindo Ghose, whose career will be discussed in the next volume, is, without question, the greatest figure in Indo-Anglian literature and one of the major literary figures of the century.

Among other early Indo-Anglian poets, Behramji Malabari and Rām Śarmā were good versifiers, while Nagesh Viśva-nāth Pai was an accomplished master of blank verse. Pai's *Angel of Misfortune* is one of the best narrative romances in Indo-Anglian literature.

In fiction and drama, too, some works of fiction appeared in the nineteenth century, and many of Bankim-chandra Chatterji's novels were issued also in English. Rājam Iyer, author of *Kamalāmbal* in Tamil, also wrote an English novel by name *Vāsudeva Śāstrī.* Madhaviah's *Thillai Govindan* and Rāmakṛishṇa's *Dive for Death* were other early works of fiction. Cornelia Sorabji's stories and Jogendra Singh's novels were also striking in their presentation.

XVII. SCRIPTS IN INDIA OF THE PRESENT DAY.

Three distinct types of script are in use to write the various Indian languages. We have in the first instance the national Indian system of writing which is of Indian origin and which goes back to the Brāhmī script of the third and fourth centuries B.C. and earlier. This Brāhmī script was a single pan-Indian script in the centuries before and immediately after Christ. Then, as the country split up into different States, this script began to change in the different areas. After about 10 centuries of such continued change in different parts of India, it gave rise to various present-day alphabets of Indian origin which are current in the country. These ranged themselves into five groups—three of which belonged to North India and two to South India. In North India we have—

(i) The North-Western group, to which belong the Śāradā script of Kashmir and a number of allied systems of writing which were current in the various Western Himalayan States, besides Gurmukhi in which Panjābi is written and printed by the Sikhs, and the Landa or the cursive script in which the businessmen of Sindh keep their accounts and write letters.

(ii) The Nāgarī script, which was originally the script of Western U. P. and Rājasthān-Gujarāt, was adopted later by the Brāhmaṇas of Mahārāshṭra (who called it *Bāḷabodha* or 'Script for the use of children', as opposed to the native script called *Modi*, of south Indian affinites, in which Marāṭhī used to be written). The modern Nāgarī or Devanāgarī script originated within this group. At one time the Nāgarī was confined to Gujarāt, Rājasthān and Western U.P., but now it has spread, with the spread of Hindī, throughout the greater part of Northern India. It is really the script from which Western Hindī as well as the Rājasthāni and Gujarātī speeches were born.

(iii) The Eastern Group of North Indian scripts within which come the Newāri of Nepal, Maithili, Bengali-Assamese and Oriyā. This script was current in its oldest form in Eastern U.P., Bihar, Nepal, Orissa, Bengal and Assam.

In addition to the above three North-Indian groups of scripts, we have in South India—

(iv) The Telugu-Kannaḍa group, and

(v) The Grantha-Tamil-Malayālam group.

The Sinhalese of Ceylon is an evolved form of the Grantha from the Tamil country.

The Śāradā script was confined to Kashmir, and it has never been put in type. It is a script which is dying out; only a handful of Brāhmaṇas in Kashmir cultivate it to write Sanskrit, as well as their own language, Kashmiri. The Nāgarī script is replacing it for Sanskrit, and the Perso-Arabic script is now used to write Kashmiri, as over 90% of the Kashmiri people are Muslim.

The Gurmukhi is confined to the Sikhs in the Panjāb (who are now passionate supporters of this script, and would not think of writing Panjābi in the Nāgarī); and in its origin, Gurmukhi belongs to the same group as Kashmiri. The Landa script is current among a handful of business people, and it has no importance, being only a written script.

The Nāgarī is now the most important of the Indian alphabets. It is the alphabet of Hindī, and it claims the homage of 140 to 150 millions of people using Hindī, and of over 25 millions using Marāṭhī; besides, most Gujarātī speakers (over 12 millions) would be able to read it. It took its present form near about 1000 years ago, and it is just a sister-script to Śāradā, Bengali and the South Indian scripts. It has acquired, however, a fresh prestige during British times when it gradually came to be accepted all over India as the pan-Indian script in printing Sanskrit. That was a direct result of the centralizing tendencies of the British rule in India. Sanskrit had no single script for the whole of India, and it was written in the different provincial scripts along with the local languages. But with the establishment of the Indian Universities, and through a common endeavour in Sanskrit studies in which the printing press became an important ally, the need for a common script for Sanskrit for use in the whole of India was supplied by Nāgarī, with the full support of a number of European Sanskritists also. The Nāgarī script also came to acquire a new sobriquet, the *Deva-nāgarī* or "the Divine Nāgarī", because Sanskrit as the language of the Gods came largely to be printed in it.

The Bengali-Assamese script is virtually one script—only Assamese differs from Bengali in one letter, and has an extra letter for the sound of *w* or *v*. This script is very much like Maithili in which the Maithili speech is written, and in which Maithili scholars (particularly of the older generation) still write Sanskrit. Nāgarī is now replacing Maithili in the domain of Maithili printing, although a few Maithili books were printed with Maithili type. But there is no enthusiasm about the continuance of the Maithili script—the forces of Nāgarī are too strong. The Newāri script of Nepal in which the Tibeto-Burman Newāri language as well as Sanskrit used to be written in the country of Nepal is in a similar state. It was never put in type, and now Nāgarī is taking its place.

Oriyā in its origin is related to Bengali-Assamese, Newāri and Maithili, but it developed some peculiar shapes from the 15th century onwards. It is used to write and print both Oriyā and Sanskrit in Orissa.

With regard to the South Indian scripts, Kannaḍa and Telugu are almost the same script with certain minor differences in the shapes of the letters; and there has been some talk about having one common script for the two languages.

The Grantha script is derived from the old script of the Pallavas as it was current about 650 A.D., and Sanskrit is written and printed in the Tamil country in the Grantha script. The Malayālam is only a provincial form of the Grantha; and the Tamil script is only an abridged form of the same Grantha.

We have thus in India the following scripts of native Indian origin which are living ones:—Nāgarī, Gurmukhi, Bengali-Assamese, Oriyā, Telugu, Kannaḍa, Tamil, Grantha and Malayālam, besides Gujarātī, which is but a cursive or abbreviated form of Nāgarī.

The Persian or rather the Perso-Arabic script came to India with the Persian language which was introduced by the Persian-using Muslim Turki conquerors, and became established in the country from the 13th century. Some centuries later, the Hindī language in its Deccani form began to be written in this script; and gradually in the 18th century when Urdu had evolved in Delhi city, a slightly modified and enlarged Persian script became established for Urdu. During the 4th quarter of the 19th century, Sindhi, in the hands of the Hindu administrative officers in the province also adopted an elaborate form of the Persian script. Kashmiri was the third Indian language to adopt this Perso-Arabic script.

There are some inherent difficulties in employing any form of the Perso-Arabic script for languages other than a Semitic speech like the Arabic, and it is not at all a suitable medium to write an Indian language. For instance, its vowel sounds are not properly indicated and they are frequently left out, and the reader will be able to guess the proper pronunciation of the written word only from his knowledge of the language and the context. A single letter for *y*, for instance, stands for the values of the consonant *y*, and of the vowels long *e* and long *i* and the diphthong *ai*. Similarly, the letter for *w* stands for long *o*, long *u* and the diphthong *au*, besides the consonant *w* or *v*.

Now we have the Roman script, which was brought to India by the Europeans: first, by the Portuguese, then by the English, the Dutch and the French. Some Indian languages are now written in the Roman script—for example, the Konkani speech of the coastal areas of Mahārāshṭra with its centre at Goa, and a number of primitive languages like Santali, Khasi, the Naga dialects etc. The use of the Roman script for all-India languages is advocated by a number of linguistic and other scholars in India, and the problem of script has now to some extent taken the form of a selection between the Nāgarī and the Roman.

---

1. *The Cultural Heritage of India,* Second Edition, (1958), Vol. I, pp. 53-4.
2. Ibid, 66.
3. Ibid, 66-7.
4. Cf. R. C. Majumdar, *History of the Freedom Movement in India,* Vol. I, pp. 474-5; III. 52, 544-5.
5. This section is based on an article by Dr. Raghavan in the *Madras University Journal,* Centenary Number (1957), pp. 175-204. Unless otherwise stated, the quotations are also from the same article.
6. *ABORI,* XXXII, 322.
7. The account of the Bengali periodicals is based on B. N. Banerji's *Bāṁglā Sāmayik Patra.*

7a. For details, cf. Ch. VI, Section I.

8. Quoted from an unpublished article of Dr. S.K. Chatterji.

8a. 'Tagore' is the anglicised form of 'Ṭhākur'.

9. See above, Vol. IX, pp. 917, 922, 933.

9a. This is the correct form for the popular 'Keshab' used elsewhere.

10. *Contemporary Indian Literature,* published by Sahitya Akademi, New Delhi, Second Edition, (1959), p. 173.
11. Ibid.
12. Ibid.
13. P. Sen, *Modern Oriya Literature,* p. 62.
14. Ibid, p. 51.
15. Ibid, pp. 57-8.

15a. Cf. *J.A.S.,* Vol. 1, 1959, No. 3 p. 236.

16. Diwan Bahadur K. S. Ramaswami Sastri, *The Indian P.E.N.,* July, 1942.

16a. Cf. Vol. IX, pp. 37-41, 996-8.

17. The Malayālam is spoken today by over 14 millions of people. The figure, ten millions, given in this series, Vol. VI, p. 529, should be corrected accordingly.
18. For a brief sketch of his life, see Zubaid Ahmad, *India's Contribution to Arabic Literature,* p. 161.
19. The seven "Suspended Poems" of pre-Islamic Arabia.
20. Stories of a dramatic type woven around a fictitious hero, very talented, but at the same time highly unscrupulous.
21. See *Tā'rikh al-Nawā'it* by Aziz Jang of Hyderabad. They were originally sailors.
22. Died in 1827. He is the author of a work on Arabic Grammar (*al-Risala fi al-Nahw*).
23. See Zubaid Ahmad, p. 383.
24. He was a contemporary of another great scholar, Maulanā 'Abd'ul 'Ali of Farangi Mahal who, on account of his encyclopaedic learning, was known as Bahr al 'Ulūm (the ocean of sciences). He died in 1818.
25. See Zubaid Ahmad, pp. 114, 186.
26. That Ghālib was proud of his Persian poetry and considered it to be of much more value than his Urdu poetry, is clear from one of his verses which runs as follows:—
    Farsi bīn ta ba-bīnī naqshhā'i rang rang,
    Buqzur az majmū'ai-Urdu ki birang-i-man ast.
    ("See my Persian verses that thou mayst behold multi-coloured pictures,
    Pass by the collection of my Urdu poetry which is without my (true) colour").
27. The first collection was made by Ghālib's pupils in his lifetime under the title of *Urdu-i-Mu'allā.*
28. Ghālib addresses him as "Mirza" Tufta in his letters, a title of which, according to Muhammad Husain Azād, he was very proud.
29. See *Mauj-i-Kauthar,* pp. 220 ff.
30. An unpublished article of Dr. S. K. Chatterji, on which this section is based.
31. Cf. Ch. XII (L).
32. See above, pp. 38-9.
33. See above, p. 172.

CHAPTER VI (XLIV)

THE PRESS

I. GROWTH OF INDIAN PRESS UP TO 1857

At the time when the British rule was established in India the Press did not occupy any important place in the development of political ideas even in England. Nor did journalism, associated with politics, attain a high standard. Even *The Times*, in 1795, supported the Government in return for a pension of £600. No wonder, then, that the less important journals were "worthless rags, venal, making the most of their nuisance value." Even at the beginning of the nineteenth century journalism was not regarded as a very respectable profession in Britain.[1]

It is therefore easy to understand both the nature of early periodical Press in India and the Government's reaction to it. The journalism in India was started by European adventurers, who could not possibly be imbued with any high ideal or standard of honesty and efficiency. Their principal object seems to have been to amuse the readers, and more often than not, it was achieved by publication of scandals and scurrilous personal attacks against men of high position, and abuses of Government, which were likely to be appreciated by all save the handful of officials.

The East India Company looked upon the Indian territories as its personal and private property, and all Englishmen in India who were not its servants were regarded by it as 'interlopers and trespassers'. The latter fully requited this sentiment. Unofficial Englishmen in India felt no loyalty or allegiance to the Company, and were prone to find fault with the monopolist corporation. They therefore vigorously criticised the Government and the officials, and naturally enjoyed the abuses hurled at them in the periodical Press. There was thus almost a tug of war between the officials who not only disliked the newspaper men, but felt supreme contempt for them, and the latter who made it a point to annoy the Government and their servants, not only by fair criticism of their policy and action, but even occasionally descending to an attack on the domestic affairs and private morals of officials, both high and low. This is fully illustrated by the early history of periodicals in India which were all written in English and edited by Englishmen. In 1767 an attempt was made by Bolts to start a newspaper, but it was nipped in the bud as the Government deported the author of the enterprise. In 1780 James Augustus Hicky, with the previous approval of the Government, started a weekly paper called *Bengal Gazette* or *Calcutta General Advertiser*, which described itself as "A Weekly Political and Commercial Paper Open to all Parties, but influenced by None".[2] It consisted of only two sheets, about twelve inches by eight, of which much space was occupied by advertisements. Its distinctive feature was the comments on the private affairs of individuals which caused considerable annoyance to many and great commotion and excitement in the small Anglo-Indian community. For he spared none and "missionaries, officials, the Chief Justice, the Governor-General and his wife were all in turn attacked". The Government withdrew the right to circulate the paper through the channel of the General Post Office. Hicky denounced the Government action as the "strongest proof of arbitrary power and influence that can be given", and bitterly attacked both Warren Hastings, the Governor-General, and Sir Elijah Impey, the Chief Justice. It is true that Hicky's paper published scurrilous attacks on individuals, mostly written by others, but he showed a rare courage in fighting the Government, almost single-handed, for defending the liberty of the Press, and in this connection wrote some words which deserve a place in the history of the Indian Press: "Mr. Hicky considers the Liberty of the Press to be essential to the very existence of an Englishman, and a free G—t. The *subject* should have full liberty to declare his principles, and opinions, and every act which tends to *coerce* that liberty is *tyrannical* and injurious to the COMMUNITY".[3] More than forty years were to pass before India again heard a similar stentorian voice this time of an Indian—in defence of the liberty of the Press. In 1782 a missionary and the Governor-General himself brought libel cases against Hicky. Hicky was convicted and sent to prison and his paper was discontinued. Six more papers were started in Calcutta between 1780 and 1793, and the editor of one of these was deported by Sir John Shore. Among them *India Gazette* (1780), *Calcutta Gazette* (1784), and *Hurkaru* (or *Hircarrah*), particularly the last-named one, attained some distinction.

In Madras, the weekly *Madras Courier*, started in 1785, enjoyed official favour. Two other papers followed in 1795. The editor of one of them, *India Herald*, was deported for having made libellous attacks on the Government and the Prince of Wales, while the editor of the other, the *Weekly Madras Gazette*, "was prohibited from publishing copies of the General Orders of the Government until they had been submitted for the inspection of the Military Secretary". Four years later, on 29 June, 1799, a general order was issued by the Madras Government requiring all the newspapers to be submitted to the inspection of the Government before their publication.

In Bombay, the first paper, the weekly *Bombay Herald,* appeared in 1789. Then came *Bombay Courier* in 1790 and the *Bombay Gazette* in 1791. The last-named incurred official wrath for a criticism of the police administration, and the editor was ordered to submit every issue for censorship before publication. He soon regained official favour, and in 1792 his paper was amalgamated with the *Bombay Herald.*[4]

Although these papers occasionally criticised the actions of the Government, they were primarily intended for Englishmen in India, and were, generally speaking, of non-political character. They published orders of the Government and Indian news, letters to the Editor, personal news, notes on fashion, extracts from papers published in U. K., Parliamentary reports, news-letters, and reports from various parts of Europe, etc. Editorials were written mostly on political topics and military affairs which would interest only an Englishman.

Periodicals in vernacular did not appear before A.D. 1818. The first Bengali monthly, *Digdarśana* (Indicator of Ways), started under the editorship of J. C. Marshman in April, 1818, had a brief existence. But the weekly, *Samāchāra-darpaṇa* (Mirror of News), under the same editorship, the first issue of which was published on May 23, 1818, had a very long and useful, though somewhat chequered career. Although J. C. Marshman, a missionary of Serampore, was its nominal editor, it was really conducted by Bengali Pandits. From the old files of the paper, which are still available, it appears to have disseminated liberal views and useful information on a variety of topics of local interest.[4a] Both these papers were published from Serampore. About the same time a weekly paper, *Bāṅgāl Gejeṭi (Weekly Bengal Gazette)* was published in Calcutta. Neither the name of the editor, nor the date of its first publication is definitely known. Most probably it was edited by Hara-chandra Ray, a member of the Ātmīya Sabhā founded by Rammohan Roy, and was first issued on 15 May, 1818. If so, it was the first vernacular newspaper in Bengal.[4b] No file of this paper is, however, available. and it did not continue for more than a year. On 4 December, 1821, appeared the weekly *Sambāda-Kaumudī* (Moon of Intelligence), a "newspaper conducted exclusively by natives in the native language". Raja Rammohan Roy was the heart and soul of the paper, though there was a nominal editor. As could be expected, the views of the paper were advanced and liberal. But Rammohan's religious and social reforms, particularly his strong advocacy of the abolition of *Sati,* weaned away a large number of supporters, and a rival paper, *Samāchāra-Chandrikā* (Moonlight of News), was started on 5 March, 1822, as the organ of the orthodox community. It was at first a weekly, but became a bi-weekly in 1829. The *Sambāda-kaumudī* had to be closed down in 1822 by Rammohan, though it was subsequently revived by others and became a bi-weekly in 1830.[5] Rammohan also started the first weekly journal in Persian, *Mīrāt-ul-Ākhbār* (Mirror of News), in Calcutta in April, 1822. The *Jam-i-Jahan Numa* was started by an English mercantile firm in Calcutta as an Urdu weekly on 28 March, 1822, but it soon became bilingual (Persian and Urdu). *The Baṅga-dūta* (Bengal Herald), a weekly in four languages (English, Bengali, Persian and Hindī), was started under the auspices of Rammohan Roy, Dwaraka-nath Tagore and some other distinguished citizens of Calcutta of liberal ideas, but it was edited by R. Montgomery Martin. The Gujarāti *Bombay Samāchār* was started in 1822 and is still in existence. Several Urdu papers were published in Delhi such as *Syed-ul-Ākhbār* in 1837, *Delhi Ākhbār* in 1838, and a few others, shortly afterwards. An important English journal, the *Bombay Times,* which later became the *Times of India,* was founded, or rather grew out of the *Bombay Courier,* in 1838.

By 1839 Calcutta had 26 European newspapers, including 6 dailies, and 9 Indian newspapers; Bombay had 10 European and 4 Indian journals; Madras had 9 European journals, and Ludhiana, Delhi, Agra and Serampore, each had one newspaper.[6] The progress of Indian journalism was maintained during the forties and fifties, the most important addition being the *Hindoo Patriot* of Calcutta, edited by Haris-chandra Mukherji. It was issued in 1853 under the editorship of three brothers of a Ghosh family in Calcutta, but after three or four months the entire task of editing the paper fell upon Haris-chandra Mukherji, one of the greatest Indian editors of the 19th century, of whom more will be said hereafter.[7] The objects with which this paper was founded are described as follows:

"A few disinterested—in as far as their pockets are concerned—individuals were some time past thinking of establishing a weekly newspaper in English, having for its object a fair and manly advocacy of the interests of their country and an impartial exposition of the social and political evils with which she is now afflicted...

"The discussions connected with the East India Company's Charter, which have already commenced, must command an all-absorbing interest in the hearts of all true friends of India. An organ of the people, conducted by natives, on catholic and enlightened principles, must then be greatly needed, and without presuming to set up as the *only* organ of the hundred millions whose destinies are bound up with the welfare of this land, the *Hindoo Patriot* may be allowed to take its stand as a champion, however insignificant, of the neglected rights of the country and a zealous and unflinching advocate for constitutional reform."[8]

A number of Vernacular papers was also added. *Rast Goftar*, a Gujarāti fortnightly, was published in Bombay in 1851 under the editorship of Dadabhai Naoroji. Next year, *Ākhbār-o-Soudāgar* was founded as a Gujarāti tri-weekly by Dadabhai Kavasji.

Among the English papers, current in 1851, may be mentioned, the *Friend of India, Hurkaru, Englishman, Bombay Times, Madras United Services Gazette, Delhi Gazette, Citizen, Agra Messenger, Moffussilite, Lahore Chronicle, Eastern Star, Madras Spectator* and *Weekly Journal.*

From the very beginning the Vernacular Press distinguished itself by its high ideals of disseminating useful knowledge and information and discussing all problems of public interest with a view to instructing the people. The high sense of editorial duty and responsibility was expressed as follows, as far back as 1822, by Raja Rammohan Roy in the prospectus of the *Mīrāt-ul-Ākhbār:* "My only object is that I may lay before the public such articles of intelligence as may increase their experience, and tend to their social improvement; and that to that extent of my abilities I may indicate to the rulers a knowledge of the real situation of their subjects and make the subjects acquainted with the established laws and customs of their rulers: that the rulers may the more readily find an opportunity of granting relief to the people; and the people may be put in possession of the means of obtaining protection and redress from their rulers."[9] This ideal could not be realized by everyone, but in any case the Vernacular Press offered a refreshing contrast to the English Press which catered only to a limited group—British residents in India—, was flippant in tone, and had amusement and entertainment rather than instruction as its primary object. The latter neither represented nor defended the interests of the Indians.

The English Press was soon divided into two categories. In addition to papers owned and edited by Englishmen, there were a few, written in English but owned and edited by Indians. As the latter had more in common with the Vernacular Press than the former, there gradually grew a sharp distinction between what may be called the Indian (both English and Vernacular) and Anglo-Indian (English) Press.

For obvious reasons it was the Anglo-Indian Press that exercised the real power. They already exhibited the anti-Indian spirit which was to be their hall-mark throughout the nineteenth century. When Bentinck employed Indians in responsible offices under the Company, 'he was attacked by the Press of India as no Governor-General has since been attacked.'[10] Yet this Anglo-Indian Press claimed to voice the public opinion of India. Macaulay truly described the state of things in the following words: "That public opinion means the opinion of five hundred persons who have no interest, feeling, or taste in common with the fifty millions among whom they live; that the love of liberty means the strong objection which the five hundred feel to every measure which can prevent them from acting as they choose towards the fifty millions."[11] John Stuart Mill also observed in his evidence before the Lords' Committee in 1852: "...The English newspaper Press in India is the organ only of the English society, and chiefly that part of it unconnected with the Government. It has little to do with the Natives and with the great interests of India."[12]

It is difficult to estimate the influence of the Press, either for good or for evil, upon the Indians. According to one view it could not have been very great during the first half of the nineteenth century. For, the circulation of the papers was very small and only an infinitesimal proportion of Indians had ever any access to them. A fairly reliable estimate of the circulation of Indian newspapers about the middle of the nineteenth century shows "that eight Bengali newspapers of Calcutta between them had not 1,300 subscribers; that the interior of the country took less than 200 copies; that in January 1837 only 151 copies were sent by post out of Calcutta, and 195 in a month in 1843; that all the English papers of Calcutta, with an aggregate circulation of nearly 4,000, had between them only 125 Indian subscribers."[13] The writer who worked out these figures expressed the view (in 1843) that "a newspaper was not reckoned among the wants of the people." An Indian contemporary, however, disagreed and said that "educated Indians were beginning to want a newspaper." He pointed out that there were fifty vernacular presses in Bengal town and country, printing periodical journals and books.[14]

The evidence of Reverend James Long, partly quoted above,[15] throws very interesting light on the importance of the Vernacular Press. He says that the number of printed Bengali books increased from 300,000 copies in 1853 to double that number in 1857, and that some Bengali newspapers were circulated widely as far as the Panjāb. In view of Long's intimate knowledge of the subject, his view should command great confidence.

But whatever we might think of this, the growth of Indian Press caused alarm in the minds of many Englishmen. Dundas, the President of the Board of Control, expressed the fear, as far back as 1811, that "the very government would be shaken to its foundations if unlicensed publications were allowed to circulate over the continent of Hindustan."[16] Even British officials like Munro and Elphinstone, who were by no means lacking in sympathy for Indian aspirations, expressed grave apprehensions that the sovereignty of England over India would be jeopardized by a free and unrestricted Press in India. In an elaborate minute, dated 12 April, 1822, Munro discussed the question, and was particularly nervous that a free Press might provoke a spirit of independence in the army.[17] "A free press and the dominion of strangers," said he, "are things, which are incompatible and which cannot long exist together; for what is the first duty of a free press? It is to deliver the country from a foreign yoke and to sacrifice to this one great object every measure and consideration."[18] Lord Elphinstone, Governor of Bombay, also held that unrestricted freedom of the Press was incompatible with the form of the Government of India which must be despotic for a long time to come.[19] On the other hand, Leicester Stanhope published a small brochure in London in 1823 in which he entered a vigorous plea in favour of a free Press in India.[20] Captain Francis Homes, in a book published in London in 1824, argued that a free Press was the truest friend of good government, the best protection against sedition and revolution, and was particularly necessary to India as her people had no other way of bringing their grievances to the notice of the Government possessing vast discretionary powers.[21] Even among high British officers in India there were advocates of free Press, and the most prominent among them was Sir Charles Metcalfe to whom reference will be made later.

This tug of war between the two principles of freedom and control of the Press also made its influence felt in the Government of India's attitude to the Press.

II. THE GOVERNMENT AND THE PRESS

Reference has been made above to the action taken by the Government in Calcutta, Bombay, and Madras against newspapers and their editors. But it was not till the very end of the eighteenth century that any general policy was adopted towards the Indian Press. Some restrictive measures were thought necessary during the prolonged war between England and France, particularly as Napoleon was believed to have a plan of invading India. To prevent the publication of military intelligence which might help the enemy was the principal object, but the comments of seditious nature published in some English newspapers furnished an additional ground. As an extreme instance, reference may be made to the observation made in an issue of the *Asiatic Mirror* of 1798, to the effect that the handful of Englishmen in India could be easily killed if each Indian merely threw a brickbat at them. The writings of this character, though few and far between, gave a handle to Wellesley who, following the prevalent attitude of his time, was intolerant of press criticism and angry with the whole tribe of editors. So he was not content merely with the suppression of individual papers, and deportation of individual editors, which had so long been the only means adopted by the Government to control the Press. Wellesley forged a new weapon in 1799 in the shape of Regulations for the press which laid down that no newspaper was to be published at all until the manuscript or proof-sheets of the whole paper, including advertisements, were submitted to and approved by the Government. The penalty for violating the Regulations was the deportation of the editor to Europe. The restrictions were extended by Minto even to religious books.[22]

The penalty touched only the editors born in Europe, as they alone were in the field at the time. The Europeans born in India, as well as natives of India, who gradually took up journalism since 1818, were exempt from the operations of the Regulations. This anomaly induced the Marquess of Hastings to abolish the pre-censorship and draw up a new set of rules in 1818 for the guidance of newspapers, with a view to prevent the discussion of dangerous or objectionable topics. These rules did not possess the force of law as they were not passed into Regulation in a legal manner. There was, therefore, no longer any legal restriction on the Indian Press.

The action of the Marquess of Hastings was hailed with joy in India and the leading officials and merchants of Madras (where the system of censorship had been operated with considerable severity) decided, in a public meeting, to present an Address to Lord Hastings in the name of the European inhabitants of Madras. In reply to this Address, which was presented to him in Calcutta, Lord Hastings made a remarkable speech in favour of the freedom of the Press. He referred to his "habit of regarding the freedom of publication as a natural right of my fellow subjects." In support of it he observed that "it is salutary for Supreme Authority, even when its intentions are most pure, to look to the control of Public Scrutiny. While conscious of rectitude, that authority can lose none of its strength by its exposure to general comment. On the contrary, it acquires incalculable addition of force."[23]

Lord Hastings gave a practical demonstration of his views in dealing with the famous James Silk Buckingham, the turbulent editor of the *Calcutta Journal,* which made its first appearance as a bi-weekly paper of eight quarto pages on 2 October, 1818. Buckingham was a Whig and propagated most liberal views of the West through his paper which was described as "well conducted," "independent" and "clever." As an editor, he said, he conceived his duty to be "to admonish Governors of their duties, to warn them furiously of their faults, and to tell disagreeable truths." Of these he gave more than ample evidence, and consequently had frequent encounters with the authorities. He was warned and admonished, and expressed regret, more than once, but always took care to point out "that it was the general impression that the press was free." It became almost a regular policy, on the part of the Government, to reprimand but not to punish, and with the editor, to regret but not to comply. Matters, however, soon headed for a crisis. An article in the *Calcutta Journal* criticised the Bishop for allowing Chaplains to leave their local duties in order to perform matrimonial ceremonies elsewhere, even during Christmas. The Government demanded the name of the author of the article. Buckingham replied that he did not know, as the contributor was anonymous, but he thought that the "publication might be productive of good." Lord Hastings' Government immediately informed Buckingham that should he persevere in this policy his license to reside in India would be annulled and he must quit the country. Buckingham sent a spirited reply on 27 July, 1821. The Government decision, he said, "would give the friends of the Freedom of the Press considerable pain because it really reduced the freedom of opinion to a more perilous and uncertain state than it was under the existence of the censorship." As a matter of fact, the Chief Secretary, W. B. Bayley, and Adam, a member of the Council, were both opposed to the policy of the Marquess of Hastings, and the Council made several attempts to deport Buckingham. Lord Hastings, however, overruled his Council, and order for Buckingham's deportation was negatived.[24] Other events soon occurred,—which gave Buckingham many opportunities to criticise the Government, 'for the public good,' and Adam to repeat his view of the necessity of deporting Buckingham, also 'for the public good.' Unfortunately for Buckingham, Adam became the officiating Governor-General on 13 January, 1823, after the departure of Lord Hastings. He took a speedy vengeance on Buckingham as will be related later.

Adam and the members of his Council were definitely in favour of muzzling the Press. The grounds for these restrictions were recorded as follows by W. B. Bayley, a member of the Governor-General's Council, in a minute dated October 10, 1822:

"The stability of the British dominion in India mainly depends upon the cheerful obedience and subordination of the officers of the army, on the fidelity of the native troops, on the supposed character and power of the Government, and upon the opinion which may be entertained by a superstitious and unenlightened Native population of the motives and tendency of our actions as affecting their interests.

"The liberty of the press, however essential to the nature of a free state, is not, in my judgment, consistent with the character of our institutions in this country, or with the extraordinary nature of our dominion in India."[25]

On October 17, 1822, even before the Marquess of Hastings left India, the Government of India wrote to the Court of Directors asking for power to exercise a more efficient and decided control over the Press. The Court hardly required any such recommendation. They formulated their views in 1823 in the following words:

"A free Press is a fit associate and necessary appendage of a representative constitution. Wherever a Government emanates from the people, and is responsible to them, the people must necessarily have the privilege of discussing the measures of the Government; and whenever the people choose representatives to make laws affecting their persons and property, the right of animadverting on the mode in which this trust is discharged belongs, of course, to the party delegating it. But in no sense of the term can the Government of India be called a free, a representative, or a popular Government; the people had no voice in its establishment, nor have they any control over its acts.

"The Governments in India exercise a delegated authority, derived from the Court of Directors and the Board of Control. The Government of India resides in this country (England), and is, of course, responsible to the English public, in common with the Government of England. It is in this country, therefore, and not in India, that its measures ought to be discussed."[26]

The Court of Directors had already refused to approve of the change introduced in 1818; but as the despatch in which they refused to sanction this change did not receive the approval of the Board of Control, they could not restrict the freedom of the Press granted by the Governments of Bengal and Bombay, and censorship continued only in Madras. The Court of Directors then approached the Ministry for passing a new Act of Parliament in order to enlarge the powers of the Indian Governments for checking the abuses of the Press. They suggested that the "Local Governments should be empowered to grant and withdraw licenses to printing presses and to put down any press printing without a license." But though the ministers refused this request, Adam, who was officiating as Governor-General after the Marquess of Hastings, practically enforced the old rigorous restrictions as far as it lay in his power. He deported James Silk Buckingham, the editor of the *Calcutta Journal*, for expressing disapproval of the acceptance by Dr. Bryce, the Head Minister of new Scotch Church, of the post of clerk of the Stationery under the East India Company. The *Journal* was suppressed and the Assistant Editor was arrested and put on board a ship bound for England.[27] But Adam did not stop here. On 14 March, 1823, a rigorous Press Ordinance was issued which prescribed that no one should publish a newspaper or other periodical without having previously obtained a license from the Governor-General in Council by submitting an affidavit.[28]

This Press Ordinance will ever be memorable for the vigorous protest it drew forth from Raja Rammohan Roy and the constitutional agitation made against it by Indian leaders.

Under the laws, then in force, every new legislative measure had to be submitted to the Supreme Court for registration. The new Press Ordinance was submitted on 15 March, 1823, and two days later five distinguished citizens of Calcutta led by Raja Rammohan Roy submitted a memorial to the Supreme Court for hearing objections against it. It was a remarkable document discussing in a logical manner and well-chosen diction the general principles on which the claim for freedom of the Press was based in all modern countries. An English lady, Miss Collet, has referred to this memorial as the *"Areopagitica of Indian history."*[29] Macnaghten, the sole acting Judge of the Supreme Court, who heard the memorial, dismissed it, but had the candour to admit that "before the Ordinance was entered or its merits argued in Court, he had pledged himself to Government to give it his sanction."[30] Having failed to get any redress, Raja Rammohan made an "Appeal to the King in Council,"[31] but this, too, shared the fate of the memorial. Miss Collet observed on this Appeal:

> "In a language and style for ever associated with the glorious vindication of liberty, it invokes against the arbitrary exercise of British power the principles and traditions which are distinctive of British history."[31a]

The activities of Rammohan and the five leading citizens of Calcutta in connection with the Press Ordinance of 1823 constitute a notable landmark in the history of India's struggle for freedom. An English writer has observed as follows on this episode:

"Ram Mohan himself, who, though not a lawyer, had brilliant powers of understanding and expounding legal matters, drafted the petition, which the other five also signed; Chandra Kumar Tagore, Dwarkanath Tagore, Harchandra Ghose, Gauri Charan Banerji, Prasanna Kumar Tagore, all men remembered by Indians as brave patriots who dared to stand up to Company, government, and court, not on behalf of any peculiarly Indian rights, but on behalf of what they and their admirers regarded as a natural right of all men, the free access to knowledge and opinion without the intervention of any authority to say what was good for them, what not. The whole memorial shows how they had become imbued with English political principles and ways of thought. Declaring that they and their countrymen had been secured in the enjoyment of the same civil and religious privileges that every Briton was entitled to in England, they boldly asserted that the ordinance would be a sudden deprivation of one of the most precious of their rights, a right, moreover, which they had not, and could not be charged with having, ever abused. It would preclude them from communicating to the Sovereign and his Council in England the real condition of his faithful subjects in India and the treatment they experienced from the local government. It would also endanger national education by putting a stop to the diffusion of knowledge either by translations from the learned languages of the East or by the circulation of literary intelligence drawn from foreign publications."[32]

The same writer further remarks:

"Indian Calcutta, that had been little interested in the Press, and for many years afterwards found it no hardship to do without newspapers, was greatly excited by this act of daring, and thought of these men much as English people once thought of the seven Bishops. Would the bold six be put in prison for their impudence in challenging the wisdom of authorities who had in their hands, in addition to the ordinary instruments of administration, Regulation III of 1818, under which executive decision alone without cause assigned or argument heard, could put a man in Jail?"[33]

As a matter of fact the daring act of Rammohan and his five associates marks the beginning of a new type of political activity which was destined to be the special characteristic of India for nearly a century. As R. C. Dutt has justly observed:

"It was the start of that system of constitutional agitation for political rights which their countrymen have learnt to value so much in the present day."[34]

The far-reaching effects of this new type of political activity are justly estimated by the Englishman, referred to above, who, writing shortly after the Round Table Conference held in London in 1930-31, remarked as follows:

> "A Round Table Conference in London to discuss India's future, with Indians taking a full share in the discussions, would have been a preposterous and incredible suggestion to Englishmen of the Company's days. It might never have come about had the great Ram Mohan Roy not taken the lead, and three Tagores, a Ghose, and a Banerji, not joined with him in starting the process that led to it."[35]

By way of protest against the new Press Ordinance Rammohan stopped the publication of his paper *Mīrāt-ul-Ākhbār*.

Lord Amherst was instructed by his masters at the time of his nomination to the Governor-Generalship of India to proceed against Indian Press, and he tried his best to curtail its liberty as much as possible.[36] On 11 May, 1826, he issued a circular prohibiting the servants of the E. I. Company from having any connection with the public Press in any way.[37] This was revoked in 1841, but restrictions were again imposed by Lord Lytton in 1875.[38] Lord Amherst also suppressed the *Calcutta Chronicle* in 1827.[39] The Press Ordinance was not removed even by the liberal Governor-General, Lord William Bentinck, though the matter was pressed upon his attention. As a matter of fact, he was definitely opposed to the idea of freedom of the Press when he was the Governor of Madras, and in 1807, expressed the view "that the Press in India should be kept under the most rigid control."[40] As a Governor-General, though he did not make any change in the law, he never took any action under it against any newspaper. It is difficult to determine whether this was due to the absence of any legitimate occasion for interference or to any change of his views in later life. In any case it was left to his successor, Sir Charles Metcalfe, during his brief and temporary administration, to repeal the Ordinance and to remove all restraints upon the periodical Press in India.

The famous Press Law of Sir Charles Metcalfe was passed on 3 August, 1835. It received a wide, almost frenzied, applause of all Indians and a section of liberal Englishmen, but was, and has since then been, condemned even by distinguished and liberal-minded Englishmen, both in India and England.

The expediency of passing a measure of such importance at the time may justly be questioned. According to the generally accepted convention an acting Governor-General, holding office for a temporary period and daily expecting to be superseded, should have waited for the arrival of the permanent incumbent before deciding upon such a controversial issue and giving effect to it. It is difficult to offer any plea of urgency. As Metcalfe himself said, the press regulations were practically obsolete. If so, there was no particular reason to interfere at that very moment, particularly as it must have been obvious that his action might put his successor in an embarrassing position. So, however opinions might differ regarding the merit of the measure, the manner in which it was passed could find little favour and can hardly be justified.[41] At the same time it should be remembered that Adam was guilty of the same offence when he passed the Press Ordinance in 1823.

It is not possible to notice the various points of view that were urged in course of the controversy over the general issue of freedom of the Press. Raja Rammohan Roy, who advocated it as early as 1823, anticipated some of the arguments of John Stuart Mill in advocating a free Press. He referred to its intrinsic merit as a means of diffusion of knowledge and enlightenment of mind, and great practical value to the Indians as the only means of bringing to the notice of the Government the ills they suffered from and anything which might require its interference.

Sir Charles Metcalfe himself defended his action in a memorable speech in reply to a congratulatory address presented to him by the citizens of Calcutta. He held that "it is salutary for the government to have the check of a press on their conduct." He also justified his action on general principles. "Freedom of public discussion", said he, "which is nothing more than the freedom of speaking aloud, is a right belonging to the people which no government has a right to withhold." 'Those who oppose it have to show that it must necessarily cause imminent peril to the public safety which would not otherwise have occurred and cannot be averted by salutary laws.' "It also rests with them to show that the communication of knowledge is a curse and not a benefit", which it is "one of the most imperative duties of the Government to confer on the people."[42]

The essential arguments, advanced on the other side by contemporary critics, have been summed up by Thornton in an extensive review of Metcalfe's speech.[43] He points out that the diffusion of knowledge is very different from either political discussion or expression of opinion on political matter, and the restriction of the press laws applies to the latter and not to the former. He expresses grave doubts about "the expediency of exposing the minds of the people to the influence of political agitators." This idea was more fully developed even by liberal-minded statesmen like Munro and Elphinstone, though, incidentally, they expose the fallacy of Thornton's distinction between knowledge and opinion. Elphinstone observed in 1832 that as an inevitable effect of a free press "we shall have to contend at once with the most refined theories of Europe, and with the prejudices and fanaticism of Asia," and then asks: "Is it possible that a foreign government, avowedly maintained by the sword, can long keep its ground in such circumstances?"[44]

As a matter of fact, the real grounds of opposition to a free Press in India had always been the fear that it would alienate against the British Government not only the people but, what mattered more, the Indian army on which rested the main strength of the British in India. The Court of Directors actually expressed the fear that free discussions of political questions in newspapers might "goad on the sepoys to revolt."

Sir Charles Metcalfe met this argument in a few words which deserve to be placed by the side of the more well-known speech of Macaulay in the same tenor. "If their argument be", said he, "that the spread of knowledge may eventually be fatal to our rule in India, I close with them on that point". He expressed his hope that the increase of knowledge in India would strengthen and not destroy the British Empire. But he maintained that, "whatever may be the consequence, it is our duty to communicate the benefits of knowledge." Then he observed: "Whatever, however, be the will of Almighty Providence respecting the future government of India, it is clearly our duty, as long as the charge be confided to our hands, to execute the trust to the best of our ability for the good of the people. The promotion of knowledge—of which the liberty of the press is one of the most efficient instruments—is manifestly an essential part of that duty. It cannot be, that we are permitted by divine authority to be here merely to collect the revenues of the country, pay the establishment necessary to keep possession, and get into debt to supply the deficiency. We are doubtless here for higher purposes; one of which is to pour the enlightened knowledge and civilization, the arts and sciences of Europe, over the land, and thereby improve the condition of the people. Nothing, surely, is more likely to conduce to these ends than the liberty of the press."[45]

Even the most ardent Indian supporters of British rule in India —a class which dominated Indian politics throughout the nineteenth century—could scarcely improve upon the remarkable utterance of

Sir Charles Metcalfe. Unfortunately he belonged to a microscopic minority in England, and did not represent in any way the real views of the Englishmen. The extremity to which even enlightened Englishmen could stoop down, when it concerned the safety of the British Empire in India, may be gathered from the remarks of Thornton on Metcalfe's address referred to above. In course of it Metcalfe had observed: "If India could only be preserved as a part of the British empire by keeping its inhabitants in a state of ignorance, our domination would be a curse to the country, and ought to cease." Thornton challenges this statement and argues that "to make this apparent, it must be shown that, but for the domination of England, knowledge would be advanced and extended." In other words, since, in his opinion, those who ruled before the English, or were likely to succeed them, did not, or would not, encourage knowledge, the British could not be blamed for dong the same. "If we render the condition of its people no better than it would be under their Native rulers it cannot justly be said, (if we make it no worse) that our domination is a curse, and ought, therefore, to cease."[46] It is a significant admission, and deserves special notice, as the general idea embodied in it exercised a profound—almost decisive—influence upon the minds of average Englishmen and even of high statesmen. While many of them honestly felt that the advantages of British rule should be extended to India as far as possible—and Thornton was one of them—they consciously or unconsciously drew a limit to such benevolent end at the point beyond which the safety and security of the British Empire in India had the remotest chance of being endangered, even to the smallest extent.

The Home authorities, as could be expected from their previous attitude, strongly condemned the measure and penalised its author by passing over his claims to the first vacant Governorship. When Metcalfe asked for an explanation, he received, "through their Secretary an answer so dry and laconic, that on the very day when he received it he intimated his desire to retire from the service of the Company".

The dangers apprehended from the freedom of the Press proved illusive. The Government found no necessity during the next twenty years to pass any Press legislation, save during the great outbreak of 1857, and even then a temporary legislation was enacted only for a year.

III. THE PRESS DURING THE OUTBREAK OF 1857-8.

Reference has been made above to the serious outbreaks that convulsed the whole of Northern India during 1857-8. It was inevitable that a great deal of the bitterness and race hatred engendered by the events of these two years would be reflected in the Press. But what actually took place far exceeded any reasonable anticipation. The following description of Sir George Trevelyan 'in no way exaggerated the deplorable tone of the Anglo-Indian press'.[47]

"The tone of the press was horrible. Never did the cry for blood swell so loud as among these Christians and Englishmen in the middle of the nineteenth century. The pages of those brutal and grotesque journals published by Hebert and Marat during the agony of the French revolution, contained nothing that was not matched and surpassed in the files of some Calcutta papers. Because the pampered Bengal sepoys had behaved like double-dyed rascals, therefore every Hindoo and Mussulman was a rebel, a traitor, a murderer; therefore, we were to pray that all the population of India were to have one neck, and that all the hemp in India might be twisted into one rope. It would be wearisome to quote specimens of the style of that day. Every column teemed with invectives which at the time seemed coarse and tedious, but which we must now pronounce to be wicked and blasphemous. For what could be more audacious than to assert that Providence had granted us a right to destroy a nation in our wrath?—to slay, and burn, and plunder, not in the cause of order and civilization, but in the name of our insatiable vengeance, and our imperial displeasure? The wise ruler, whose comprehensive and impartial judgment preserved him from the contagion of that fatal frenzy, was assailed with a storm of obloquy for which we should in vain seek a precedent in history. To read the newspapers of that day, you would believe that Lord Canning was at the bottom of the whole mutiny; that upon his head was the guilt of the horrors of Cawnpore and Allahabad; that it was he who had passed round the chapatties and lotahs[47a] and spread the report that the Russ was marching down from the north to drive the English into the sea. After all, the crime charged against him was, not that he had hindered the butchery, but that his heart was not in the work. No one had the face to say, or, at any rate, no one had the weakness to believe, that Lord Canning had pardoned any considerable number of condemned rebels. His crying sin was that he took little or no pleasure in the extermination of the people whom he had been commissioned by his Sovereign to govern and protect."[48]

The Indian Press must have been somewhat kept in restraint by the fear of inevitable punishment that would follow; nevertheless passions rose high and papers in manuscript, openly inciting to rebellion, were widely spread, and mischievous misrepresentation of the intention of Government and exaggerated reports of unfortunate incidents were deliberately circulated with a view to creating disaffection toward the Government. According to Lord Canning sedition was poured into the hearts of the native population under the guise of intelligence supplied to them by the native newspapers and this was done 'sedulously, cleverly and artfully'. "In addition to perversion of facts", said he, "there are constant vilifications of the Government, false assertions of its purposes, and unceasing attempts to sow discontent and hatred between it and its subjects."[49]

Lord Canning accordingly passed the Act XV of 1857 which required licenses for keeping printing presses and authorized the Government to prohibit the publication or circulation of printed books and papers. It was to be operative for one year only and was applicable to all papers, Indian or Anglo-Indian.[50] Under the Notification dated 18 June, 1857, licenses were to be granted to a press only on condition that no book, newspaper, pamphlet etc., printed at such press, "shall contain any observations or statements impugning the motives or designs of the British Government or in any way tending to bring it into hatred and contempt, to excite disaffection or unlawful resistance to its orders, or to weaken its lawful authority, or the lawful authority of its civil or military servants".[51] Under the terms of this Act *Bengal Hurkaru,* edited by S. L. Blanchard, was suspended for six days till the editor resigned. The *Friend of India* published on 25 June, 1857, the notorious article "The Centenary of Plassey"[52] which the Viceroy deemed "most dangerous at such a crisis",[53] but the paper was let off with a warning. George Buist, the editor of the *Bombay Times,* acquired unenviable notoriety by vilifying the Indians and urging upon the Government to take more and more extreme measures. Unfortunately for Buist, the share-holders of the paper were mostly Indians, and he was asked forthwith to "entirely change the tone and tenor of his editorial writings". As he declined to do so he was dismissed.[54] Several Indian papers of Bombay—the *Bombay Samāchār*, the *Jam-e-Jamshed* and the *Rast Goftar*—vigorously defended the character of the Indians against the unmerited attack of British journalists.[55] Three papers—*Durbīn, Sultān-ul-Ākhbār* and *Samāchār Sudhāvarshan*—were prosecuted for writing seditious articles.[56]

One name stands very high among the journalists of the day, that of Haris-chandra Mukherji, the editor of the *Hindoo Patriot.* Unswayed by the passions of the day, he tried to paint the picture of the time in its true perspective, and wielded his powerful pen to expose the hollowness of the cry for danger raised by the Englishmen, and check their frenzied efforts to induce the Government to adopt extreme measures against the Bengalis. For, even though the

Bengalis took no active part in the rebellion of 1857-8, the Englishmen took alarm at their developed political consciousness and were eager to nip in the bud this potential danger to their authority. It is said that Lord Canning was considerably influenced by the judicious attitude and unbiassed tone of this Indian paper in forming his policy.

IV. THE PRESS AFTER 1858

Since the Mutiny, the papers owned and edited by the Indians rapidly grew in number. A few of them were written in English, and the large majority in vernaculars of different Provinces. They came to play an increasingly important role in the political education of the people and growth of patriotic and national sentiments among them. It would be a tedious task to prepare a list even of the prominent daily and weekly papers in different parts of India that regularly discussed political topics. Their number was large and many of them did their work with ability and honesty.

On the other hand, the papers owned or edited by Englishmen tended to become more and more anti-Indian in their general outlook, unsympathetic to Indian political aspirations, and strong supporters of Government. This was due mainly to the memory of the Mutiny,[57] and the all-important fact that the Government of India now represented, not a private mercantile firm, but the Crown of England which claimed allegiance of every loyal Englishman.

In Bengal the *Hindoo Patriot* continued to be the leading journal. By its vigorous denunciation of the indigo-planters and heroic stand on behalf of the helpless and oppressed cultivators, it occupied a unique position in Indian journalism about this period. Day after day it exposed the terrible miseries inflicted upon the indigo-cultivators, and occasionally also encouraged their passive resistance from a higher national standpoint. The following extract from its issue of 19 May, 1860, may be quoted as an instance:

"The revolution has caused the *Ryot* community a vast mass of suffering. They have been beaten, insulted, bound, starved, imprisoned, ousted from home, deprived of their property, subjected to every form of oppression one can imagine. Villages have been burnt, men carried off, women violated, stores of grain destroyed, and every coercion has been used. Yet the *Ryots* have not yielded; they have not ceased to aspire after the freedom which they feel to be their birth-right and which they have been told the law assures them. Let them but suffer on a few weeks more, and they will gain their darling object. A revolution will have been effected in their social condition, the beneficial effects of which will reach all the country's institutions. The defects of our laws, the vices of our courts, the inefficiency of our police, the oppression systematically practised by some classes, and the general prevalence of anarchy will have been exposed in a manner never hitherto made—in a manner which will make reform inevitable."[58]

The *Hindoo Patriot* also exposed the true character of the Mutiny of 1857 and boldly opposed the die-hard section of Englishmen, as already noted above.

The death of Haris-chandra Mukherji in 1861 diminished the importance of the *Hindoo Patriot* for some time. The mantle of that paper fell upon the *Indian Mirror* which was founded in 1862 under the patronage of Devendra-nath Tagore. Later Keshab-chandra Sen became its patron, and Narendra-nath Sen, its editor. Among the other important English papers may be mentioned the *Indian Field* edited by Kishori-chand Mitra, *Mukherji's Magazine* (1861), edited by Sambhu-chandra Mukhopadhyaya, and the *Bengalee* (1862), edited by Girish-chandra Ghosh. The *National Paper,* founded in 1865 by Naba-gopal Mitra, contributed a great deal to the development of nationalism in Bengal to which reference will be made later.

The leading position in Bengali journalism was again taken by the *Hindoo Patriot* under the able editorship of Krishto-das Pal. His was an honoured name, both in politics and journalism, and he was highly respected both by the people and the Government for the depth of his views and the sobriety of his judgment. For twenty-three years he was the editor of the *Patriot;* he made it a power in the country, and even the Government consulted this paper in order to feel the trends of public opinion. As Secretary of the British Indian Association, he wielded immense influence in that body and also in politics, and so the *Patriot* under his editorship acquired power, influence, and prestige such as fell to the lot of very few papers in India. He was well-known for the moderation of his views, but his spirit of independence brought him into conflict with the Government more than once.

Several factors contributed to the phenomenal growth of the Indian Press during the sixties and seventies. The Indian Councils Act of 1861 stirred the public opinion and created greater interest in politics and newspapers, the natural medium of discussing matters of political interest. As early as 1860 telegrams received by Reuter in London from various parts of Europe were sent to the *Bombay Times* by mail, and when direct telegraphic communication was established between India and Britain, important news was sent by wire.[59] So far as the Indian Press was concerned, the newly awakened consciousness of nationalism, to which reference will be made in Chapter XIII, gave a great fillip to it.

On September 28, 1861, the *Bombay Times,* which had incorporated the *Bombay Standard,* the *Telegraph* and *Courier,* changed its name to *The Times of India.* Its editor, Mr. Robert Knight, explained the change as due to the pre-eminent position occupied by the city of Bombay which, he said, "is already the capital city of India, although not as yet the seat of the Supreme Government." Then he added: "While the city is Imperial, its Press hitherto has been, in title, only provincial, and in announcing ourselves as *The Times of India* we are simply endeavouring to keep up with the march of events."[60] Unfortunately, on account of differences with his partner, Knight cut off his connection with the paper, and settled in Calcutta. In 1875 he bought the journal, *The Friend of India,* which was founded by Carey, Marshman, and Ward at Serampore in 1818. It was at first a monthly and later became a weekly, and came into prominence during the Mutiny, as mentioned above. In 1875 Knight also founded the *Statesman,* and eventually the two papers were merged under the title *The Statesman and the Friend of India.*[61] Knight was one of the few English journalists who felt sympathy for Indian cause and wielded great influence both with the people and the Government. He was a radical and held liberal views on matters relating to the administration of public affairs. When he died in 1890 the Indian Press called him "the Bayard of India" and paid glowing tributes to him.[62]

Among other important Anglo-Indian papers established about the same time as the *Statesman* may be mentioned the *Madras Mail* (1868), the first evening paper in India; the *Pioneer* of Allahabad (1865), the organ of British imperialism in India; and the *Civil and Military Gazette* of Lahore (1876), "a faithful and conscientious advocate of the true interests of the services, civil and military, in India" —to use its own words.[63]

To complete the account of the Anglo-Indian papers functioning as important organs of English public opinion in India at the end of the period under review, reference should be made to the *Englishman* of Calcutta, in a sense the oldest Anglo-Indian paper then in existence in India. For it was merely a new name for the paper called *John Bull* which was started in 1832 in order to counteract the influence of Buckingham's *Calcutta Journal,* to which reference has been made above.[64] It was an organ of the conservative section—the old Tories—and was owned by some employees of the

East India Company. To the last it maintained the same tradition and was ultra-conservative and reactionary in its views.

The Urdu Press also flourished and the majority of the Urdu organs of North India at the beginning of 1861 were edited by the Hindus.[65] There were, at this time, 11 Urdu and 6 Hindī papers, of which 8 were published at Agra, 2 at Ajmere, and 2 at Etawah.[66]

It has been described by Surendra-nath Banerji how, in 1881, he persuaded Sardar Dayal Singh Majeetia to start a newspaper at Lahore called the *Tribune*.[66a]

The Indian Press, throughout the half century that elapsed since the Mutiny, took a distinctly political and nationalistic turn without losing sight of its main object of supplying information and useful knowledge. Among the Bengali papers, the *Somaprakāśa* (1858), edited by Dwaraka-nath Vidyabhusan, was the earliest to devote itself prominently to political matters.[66b] The *Śikshādarpaṇa O Sambādasāra* (1864), a monthly edited by Bhudev Mukhopadhyay, was chiefly devoted to educational topics, but also discussed political questions. It was the first to stress the inevitable animosity between the rulers and the ruled, and coined the word *'jāti-vairitā'* to denote this. The idea underlying this was fully developed by Bankim-chandra Chatterji in the weekly *'Sādhāraṇī'* (1874), edited by Akshay-chandra Sarkar, and in the monthly *Baṅgadarśana* (1873), edited by himself. Both these Bengali papers rendered valuable services to the cause of nationalism and political progress. The following extract (in translation) from a Bengali article of Bankim-chandra reflects the new spirit with which journalism was imbued in Bengal. "It is not in human nature for the conquered to respect the conquerors or regard them as selfless benefactors, and for the conquerors to shrink from employing physical force...... This racial animosity is the natural result of our present condition; there will be no end of it so long as the foreigners rule over us, and we, though inferior, remember our past glory. We whole-heartedly pray that this conflict may influence us so long as we do not become equal to the Englishmen." Some of the Bengali papers like *Āryadarśana*, edited by Jogendra-nath Vidyabhushan, furthered the cause of nationalism by preaching revolutionary ideas through the lives of Mazzini, Garibaldi and other revolutionary leaders of Italy.

We find fearless criticism of the abuses of administration and reactionary measures of Government, not only in the Calcutta papers like *Somaprakāśa*, *Sahachar*, and *Sādhāraṇī*, but also in papers published from mofussil towns, the number of which grew apace. Among these special mention may be made of the *Hindu-hitaishiṇī* of Dacca and *Bhārata-mihir* of Mymensingh.

Most of the above journals made their appearance during the sixties. About the same time was published the *Amrita Bazar Patrika* which soon established its position as the most popular and powerful organ of national opinion, not only in Bengal, but probably in the whole of India. It was first published on February 20, 1868, as a Bengali weekly, from a village in Jessore (originally called Polomagura, but later renamed 'Amṛita Bājār'), under the editorship of Sisir-kumar Ghosh. The paper, as Sisir-kumar himself says, began by teaching that "we are we" and "they are they"—a very simple statement of racial animosity referred to above. From the very beginning it distinguished itself by a scathing exposure of the abuses of administration and a free and frank discussion of the political problems of the day. Guided by a robust spirit of nationalism it spared no effort to serve the true interests of the country, both by ruthless, destructive criticism of the reactionary policy of the Government as well as by constructive proposals of reforms. In three articles published in 1870 it stressed the eternal conflict between the interests of the rulers and the ruled, and held out Parliamentary Government in India as the only solution of the problem. It advocated the establishment of political associations, not only in each district headquarters, but also in populous villages, and also of a central association in Calcutta to co-ordinate their activities. One of the special features of the paper was to publish regular reports of misdeeds by officials in mofussil. This brought the wrath of the English officials upon the editor and his staff who were often hauled up before the court and punished. But nothing could daunt the indomitable spirit of its editor. From the second year of its issue (Feb. 25, 1869), a part of the *Patrika* was written in English. In 1871 the office of the *Patrika* was removed to Calcutta and the English portion was gradually increased. Ultimately in 1878 it turned overnight into a full-fledged English paper in order to escape from the operations of Lord Lytton's Vernacular Press Act. It was a weekly paper and, as a result of the agitation over the Age of Consent Bill, became a daily on 19 February, 1891.[67]

The *Patrika* was sometimes very outspoken in its comments. As a specimen, we may give here the translation of an extract from its issue of 31 December, 1868. "The Bengalis are determined to oppose the tyranny of Englishmen at every step. The conflict between the Bengalis and the English is becoming more and more serious every day. The English want to keep the Bengalis down, the Bengalis want to stand up. The English find that the Bengalis can no longer be cowed down by merely bullying or bribery; so they adopt sterner measures. But thousands of Bengalis are now determined either to achieve their ends or lay down their lives. In this struggle we do not blame either the English or the Bengalis. Let the Commissioner of the Presidency Division try to curb the spirit of freedom of the Bengalis as his national interest demands. But if the Bengalis do their duty Chapman will surely fail, for God is on our side. He befriends the weak and the helpless slaves, and to Him the English, the Hindu, the White, the Black, the Christian and the idolators are all alike."

Poet Nabin-chandra Sen, who met Sisir-kumar about this time, has paid the highest tribute to him and to his paper by saying that "they were the pioneers of patriotism in this country." He has related the story that a younger brother of Sisir-kumar committed suicide and left a piece of paper with the words: "It is no use keeping this life as it can do no good to our motherland." Nabin-chandra adds that the patriotic verses in his *Palāśir Yuddha*—which are some of the sublimest stanzas in Bengali literature—were inspired by Sisir-kumar. The *Samāchāra-chandrikā* wrote in its issue of January 18, 1872, "that no other journal has done as much for the freedom of the country as the *Patrika*, and it has suffered much on this account."

That the achievement of independence was the guiding idea of the paper appears clearly from a Bengali verse which regularly appeared as its motto for some time since May 7, 1868. It may be freely rendered as follows:—

"Alas! It is grievous to think how the poison of subjection has changed the sons of Āryas beyond recognition."

There can be hardly any doubt that the *Amrita Bazar Patrika* raised the tone of Indian papers and infused a new spirit of strength, fearlessness, and nationalism in Bengali journalism. The following extract from a letter of B. G. Tilak, written in 1917, gives a fair idea of its appreciation outside Bengal.

"I know with what enthusiasm and eagerness the *Patrika* was awaited in my province (Bombay) every week 40 years ago. I know how people were delighted to read his (Editor's) sarcasm, his pithy and critical notes written in racy style, simple but at the same time effective. How people longed to see the paper on the day it was due by post, how people enjoyed it—I know it personally. You in Bengal cannot know what we felt and thought in Maharashtra. ...They were really delighted to see his writings, but very few had the courage to quote these remarks before others—they enjoyed them in secret."[68]

Next to the *Amrita Bazar Patrika* the most powerful English paper in Bengal was the *Bengalee*, whose foundation has been referred to above. On January 1, 1879, Surendra-nath Banerji took over the management and editorship of this paper. In his able hands the *Bengalee* became one of the most advanced organs of national opinion. As a matter of fact, since the eighties the *Amrita Bazar Patrika* and the *Bengalee* made the greatest contribution to the national reawakening of Bengal, if not also of India.

The eighties saw the publication of two new Bengali papers, the *Baṅgabāsī* in 1881 and the *Sañjībanī* in 1883. The *Sañjībanī* adopted as its motto, "Liberty, Equality and Fraternity". The *Baṅgabāsī* was conservative and the *Sañjībanī* was liberal in its social views. Both had a long and useful career in spreading political and social ideas among the middle class rural population of Bengal. Reference may also be made to the *Sulabha-samāchāra*, the first one-pice paper in Bengali started by Keshab-chandra Sen. It was not a political paper, but its liberal views on social and educational matters, written in very simple language, contributed to the national reawakening, particularly as it had a very large circulation on account of its cheapness. The main function of these papers was to discuss all public measures and criticise the views and attitude of the foreign Government from Indian point of view. The Government naturally did not like this spirit of criticism and regarded it as dangerous to the stability of the British Government.

The Indian-owned papers were rapidly growing in number. "There were (in 1876) about sixty-two such papers in the Bombay Presidency,—Marathi, Gujerati, Hindustani and Persian; about sixty in the North-West Provinces, Oudh and the Central Provinces; some twenty-eight in Bengal; about nineteen in Madras, Tamil Telegu, Malayalam and Hindustani. Their circulations were, of a necessity, restricted but they were nevertheless expanding. It was computed about this time that there were probably 100,000 readers of such papers and that the highest circulation of any one paper was in the neighbourhood of 3,000".[69] In 1873 Sir George Campbell, the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal, ordered an inquiry into the state of the Indian-owned Press in Bengal. It was found that there were altogether thirty-eight papers in existence.[70] Campbell expressed his views as follows: "My own opinion has always been that an entirely free press is inconsistent with a despotic form of Government even if it be a paternal despotism. In such circumstances press writers are always inclined to be 'agin the government' and there is no opposing press to answer them. No doubt criticism is useful in bringing abuses to light, and press fulminations may be a sort of safety valve; but a government, whose position largely depends on the sort of moral force due to a belief in its unassailable power, can hardly afford to be constantly held up to the contempt of its subjects." "At the same time, Sir George Campbell was clear that the cure was worse than the disease if a libel on the Government could not be punished without a protracted trial which gave the matter 'all the notoriety that the most ambitious libeller could desire."[71]

"For some fifteen years weekly abstracts had been prepared of the more important articles in the Indian Press and these were made available to officials in India and to the British Press. In 1875 we find Lord Salisbury, the Secretary of State for India, informing the Government of India that his attention had been drawn by writings in the *Pall Mall Gazette* and another paper 'to various articles in the Native Press which are not only calculated to bring the Government into contempt, but which palliate, if they do not absolutely justify as a duty, the assassination of British Officers.' Lord Northbrook's Government replied that it was not desirable in the then state of the law for the Government to prosecute (under the sedition sections, as had been suggested somewhat tentatively by the Advocate-General) except in the case of systematic attempts to excite hostility against the Government.

"Faced by the growing criticism of the press, Lord Lytton studied various methods of meeting the situation....In the autumn of 1877 he prepared a Minute which was circulated to the members of his Council and to each local Government and Chief Commissioner. All, with the exception of Madras (where the press in Indian languages was not yet strong), concurred in the principle of taking legislative action. Consequently, a Bill was prepared and its substance was telegraphed to the Secretary of State whose permission was sought for its introduction".[72] The Vernacular Press Act IX of 1878 became law on March 14, and it was operative in all the provinces except Madras. Under this Act "the printer and publisher of any paper in an Indian language could be called upon to enter into a bond not to publish anything likely to excite feelings of disaffection against the Government or antipathy between persons of different races, castes and religions among His Majesty's subjects. If a newspaper contravened this regulation, it was first warned of the offence and if it re-occurred its equipment was liable to be seized. For those who wished to avoid such a risk, a system of censorship was framed by the Government and one of its officers was appointed to scrutinize proofs before publication".[73] Three members of the Secretary of State's Council were against the Bill and at the instance of the new Secretary of State, Lord Cranbrook, the clause about censorship was deleted by a fresh Bill in September, 1878.

One of the results of the Act was the foundation of the *Hindu* of Madras. Six young men, who decided to establish the paper, felt the need of an Association in Madras of a type described by one of them as follows:

"An Association which would represent the true state of the condition of the masses to the Government and their several grievances, and to get them redressed, to suggest to our Rulers the best means of utilising the latent activities of the people for the service of their country, to get recognised the claims of the sons of the soil to a proper share in the administration, to suggest modes of utilising the knowledge and attainments of the educated classes, in fact to induce our Rulers to put into practice the Magna Charta of our rights and liberties, such an Association was still a desideratum".

"Though these words apply to the Madras Native Association which was subsequently organised, they may also be taken to express the task to which the *Hindu* set itself when it was first published on 20 September, 1878."[74]

It was started under the editorship of G. Subramaniya Aiyar and Viraraghavacharya. "They were potent wheels in the machine that has made Indian Journalism the hand-maiden, if not something more, of Indian Nationalism." W. S. Blunt paid high tribute to this paper in 1884 and wrote about the editors that they "contrasted by no means unfavourably with men of their profession in London". Later, Kasturiranga Iyengar became the editor of the *Hindu* while its founder-editor G. S. Aiyar edited the Tamil paper *Swadeshamitram.*[75] The *Hindu* was started as a weekly but converted to tri-weekly from October 1883, and a daily since 1889.

There was strong opposition to the Vernacular Press Act all over the country. The *Somaprakāśa* stopped publication when a bond was demanded from its printer. The *Amrita Bazar Patrika,* the suppression of which was believed at that time to have been the main object of the new legislative measure, escaped a similar fate by changing overnight into an English journal.

While it is not difficult to understand and even appreciate the strong and universal resentment in India at the passing of the Act, it is only fair to look at the question also from the point of view of the Government. It is unreasonable to expect that a foreign Government would ignore or tolerate the disloyal sentiment openly expressed, and the hatred towards the Government consciously or unconsciously excited, by the vernacular Press. That the vernacular newspapers indulged in such expressions would be obvious from a perusal of the papers submitted to the Legislature in justification of the proposed Press legislation.[76] They contained mostly translations from the Bengali papers; and of these the *Sādhāraṇī* came in for the largest notice. Discussing the Russo-Turkish War, the *Sādhāraṇī* said that it had been deeply moved by the fall of Plevna because "we Hindus have borne and still bear the hardships and misery which follow the downfall of the prestige of a nation. In every bone, vein and pore of our bodies this sense of national degradation works as a slow consuming fire. God forbid that even our deadliest enemies should suffer as we do." The next extract from the *Sādhāraṇī* was from a fairly long article headed (in its English rendering) "Spurious Loyalty", and ran as follows:—

"A history of the non-fulfilment of promises by the British Government would be the whole history of the last hundred and fifty years..

"It is the general belief that the Viceroy's speech on the 1st of January, 1877, nullified to a considerable extent the Queen's Proclamation of 1858. Babu Surendra-nath Banerji, because he gave expression to this belief at a meeting of the Calcutta Municipality, brought down upon himself the wrath of the Sahibs (Europeans), who charged him with being disloyal.

"It was declared in 1858 that if the natives of this country proved themselves equal, all appointments, so far as practicable, would be given to them. But now we are told that all high executive offices are to be given to Englishmen only. If these two declarations are not contradictory, then henceforth there will be no difference in colour between black and white. If it amounts to disloyalty to point out this contradiction, and if for this, the Government chooses to punish us, then, we with tens of millions of Her Majesty's subjects are prepared to be punished along with Surendra-nath."

The following is an extract from *Samāja-darpaṇa* published in its last issue:

"What heart will not be pained to see the spectacle of educated natives crying for want of food, while every month batches of Englishmen, fresh from England, are taking possession of all the appointments in the Public Service? Or what political economy is this that would sanction the retention in the service of highly paid Europeans, while famine and destitution raged in the land and people groaned under the burden of taxation? Why should Mowla Bux be hanged for an offence for which Heeman receives promotion? That you should despise me as a worthless thing not to be touched, while I should worship you with flowers and sandalwood, is a thing which nature never heard before."

It would be difficult to deny that these comments exceeded the limits of legitimate criticism, and no Government, specially a Government of foreigners, could be expected to tolerate them. The only question is whether the particular legislation enacted by Lytton was justified. The Indian view was expressed by the *Somaprakāśa* in its issue of 24 December as follows:[77] "If the Vernacular Press is seditious, there is already a law to repress sedition; there are courts of law. Let complaints be lodged against them in the regularly constituted courts of the land, and let their mouths be gagged here."

The passing of the Vernacular Press Act during Lord Lytton's Viceroyalty seriously offended the public opinion throughout India, and gave a stimulus to the growth of nationalism and ideas of political unity to which reference will be made later. So in 1882 Lord Ripon repealed both the Acts of 1857 and 1878 and relied on ordinary law for the control of the Press.

Shortly after the arrival of Lord Ripon, the *Keśarī,* a Marathi daily, and the *Mahratta,* an English weekly, were founded respectively on January 4 and 2, 1881. Both were the results of great ventures undertaken by a group of Maratha young men including Chiplunkar, Agarkar, and Namjoshi, whose names have been cast into shade by that of Bal Gangadhar Tilak, the most brilliant among them. For some time the *Keśarī* was edited by Agarkar and the *Mahratta* by Prof. Kelkar. Tilak became the sole editor of the *Keśarī* in October, 1887, and it was not till 1891 that Tilak's old colleagues left him and he became the sole proprietor and the fully responsible editor of the two papers.[78] Tilak was the guiding spirit of the new type of nationalism that emerged towards the close of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth century, and the *Keśarī* and *Mahratta* became the chief organs of this new movement. It would be difficult to exaggerate the importance and significance of the role played by these two papers in the development of nationalism in India.

The last important journal, during the period under review, was the *Indian Review* published in January, 1900, by G. A. Natesan in Madras. He had a fine press and was himself the printer, publisher, manager, and editor of the *Indian Review.* Its speciality was the publication of important extracts from contemporary periodicals on various aspects of Indian problems.[79] By this monthly journal as well as by publication of books bearing on Indian nationalism, Natesan made valuable contribution to India's struggle for freedom in the twentieth century.

In spite of severe handicaps the Indian Press performed its task fairly well. It was clearly recognized, even by enlightened

Englishmen, that the Indian Press must, necessarily, be always in opposition to the Government. The Indian Press, as a body, followed this principle, and reviewed the entire administrative policy of the Government. There was hardly any topic of public importance which did not form their subject of discussion.

Among the important public questions they chiefly concerned themselves with (1) reduction of public expenditure, (2) appointment of natives to high offices under the State, (3) defects in the administration of justice in the mofussil, and (4) the existence of feelings of distinction between the conquerors and the conquered. In many cases the writers displayed quite a high level of knowledge and strong independence of views. It is impossible to over-estimate the importance of the Indian Press as a means of educating public opinion and inculcating patriotic and national views among the public. The introduction of cheap (pice) newspapers in Bengali was an important innovation for spreading political ideas among the masses.

The foundation of the Indian National Congress considerably changed the tone of both the Indian and Anglo-Indian Press, and brought politics into the forefront of discussions in both cases. The more important Indian papers now sought to educate the public in the political ideals of the Congress, and some even overstepped the limit of moderation set by that institution as its standard. The Anglo-Indian Press, with a few exceptions, criticised the political ideal of the Congress as chimerical and was definitely hostile to it. In this they reflected the British attitude which was opposed to all political aspirations of India. Racial arrogance clearly manifested itself in their outlook on Indian questions, as was amply demonstrated during the bitter Ilbert Bill controversy. What was still worse, they cast to the winds all sense of decency, fair play and justice when the interest or prejudice of Englishmen was at stake. This would be obvious from their frantic cry of protest whenever an Englishman was accused for assaulting an Indian, and the open support they gave to the tea- and indigo-planters, though guilty of brutal crimes against helpless Indians. Attention may be drawn to the comments of the *Englishman*, the *Pioneer* and the *Morning Post* on the Manipur outbreak in 1891, to which reference has been made above.[80]

It is interesting to refer in this connection to the following extract from a letter written by Lord George Hamilton, the Secretary of State, to Lord Curzon on 16 February, 1900.

"I expected you would be attacked for the strong line you have taken in connection with the Rangoon outrage. The official element, both military and civil, is so strong in India that they have a very dominant control over the English Press. We, from time to time, abuse the Native Press, and believe it to be a danger to our rule in India. I am not at all sure that the Anglo-Indian Press is not quite as mischievous, and, by its intolerance, does not greatly aggravate all racial difficulties and differences."

The tone of the Indian Press also was not always restrained, and grew more and more vehement with the growth of nationalism and political consciousness. Some extracts have already been quoted, and a few others may be added as specimens.

The taxes came in for a great deal of nasty criticism. A Bengali paper alleged, in 1863, that prostitutes were utilised to promote the sale of liquor, and condemned the Government which "for a few rupees gained now will have debauched, degraded and demoralised the mass of the people of India". The *Amrita Bazar Patrika* described the Road Cess as a "shameful imposition". While condemning the increase in salt tax in 1888 by Lord Dufferin, the *Prajā-bandhu*, a Bengali paper, wrote: "Cursed was the hour when His Excellency set foot on Indian soil. His crooked policy has impoverished India".

The drain of India's wealth came in for caustic comments. The *Samaya* wrote in 1896: "Like locusts they came in swarms to drain the country of its riches which they spend not in India but in their own country". Another paper observed in this connection that "the Muslims did not suck the peoples' blood like India's present rulers."

The top-heavy administration. due mainly to the high salaries of English officials. was strongly criticized, and when Sir John Strachey defended it on the ground that an English recruit to the I.C.S. inherited qualities from his forefathers which a Bengali candidate could never inherit, the *Baṅgabāsī*, a Bengali paper, replied: "When your tattooed ancestors lived in mountain caves or underground holes, ate raw flesh and jumped about like monkeys from tree to tree in search of fruits, our forefathers ruled over kingdoms. This is no empty boast, but historic truth."

This was merely an indirect, though vulgar, protest against the racial arrogance which often manifested itself in brutal assaults on innocent Indians, causing grievous hurts and sometimes even death, by Europeans who were let free without or with merely nominal punishment. It has been estimated that nearly 500 cases occurred every year in each of the provinces, and these supplied materials for bitter comments, sometimes mixed with satire. The *Amrita Bazar Patrika* thus commented on the murder of a *Sadhu* (mendicant) by three English soldiers at Wazirabad: "The *Sadhu* looked so much like a pig that the tommies were tempted to shoot him. Oh! dear! dear! and now a hue and cry would be raised in the native newspapers. But after all no harm is done in this case; it is the ultimate object of a *Sadhu* to seek *Nirvan* and three sons of Mars by shooting him dead simply helped him to reach his goal at once."

The foreign policy of the Government was strongly attacked. Referring to the Second Afghan War a Bengali paper wrote in 1880: "Heaven only knows where the consequences of the dishonest actions of the Hebrew Premier (Disraeli) will ultimately lead us". The *Sañjīvanī* of Calcutta wrote on the occasion of the Third Burmese War: "When we think that our money, assuming the form of bullets, is falling upon the breasts of heroic Burmese patriots, is serving to fill with lamentation thousands of Burmese homes, and is helping to deprive a people of their God-given independence, we cannot help losing all patience." Commenting on the Tibetan War of Lord Curzon the *Amrita Bazar Patrika* wrote in 1904 that "every Englishman should be ashamed" of it.[81]

The extracts from newspapers quoted in this chapter, and a few more scattered in other chapters of this volume, would suffice to show that the Press very accurately reflected the mutual relations and attitudes of the rulers and the ruled, as will be described in detail in Chapters IX, X and XI. One can easily visualise how the haughty arrogance, caused by the racial superiority complex and leading to an undisguised contempt for the 'natives', on the part of the ruling community, generated in the hearts of the Indians a sullen resentment and bitter hatred towards their white masters and their system of Government. The Press widely disseminated these ideas among the people at large and intensified the estrangement between the Indians and the Englishmen. This served as a potent factor in fostering unity and nationalism in India. The Indian Press also made valuable contribution to the growth of political ideas and development of an all-India political consciousness among the general public. It is thus impossible to exaggerate its importance as one of the most powerful elements in the building up of the Indian nation in the nineteenth century.

It could be hardly expected that the British Government would look favourably upon the Indian Press or even be indifferent to its tone. In his letter to Lord Cross, dated 21 March, 1886, Lord Dufferin refers to the agitation in Bengal, both in press and on platform, and thinks it to be due to Irish troubles. He then adds: "Day after day, hundreds of sharp-witted Babus pour forth their indignation against their English oppressors in very pungent and effective diatribes. Facts are either invented or misrepresented to suit the purpose of these ingenious gentlemen, and I must say that the way in which they serve them up is by no means discreditable to their literary power." In another letter dated 23 November, 1886, to Cross, Dufferin abuses the Bengali Press in stronger language but praises the Bombay papers: "Bengalee press seems to be worked by a very malicious and cowardly set of people, who do not seem to know what truth means. At Bombay, I am happy to say, I found among the corresponding class, even of the most advanced type, a totally different tone. Their papers are moderate, sensible, and statesmanlike, and excellent feeling exists between themselves and the English community as well as the Civil Service, and I met amongst them men of the highest character and intelligence. It seems to me the sooner we change the capital of Bengal the better."[82]

The last sentence is quite interesting,—anticipating events by a quarter of a century.

---

1. O'Malley, 189.
2. Barns, 46.
3. Ibid, 49.
4. Ibid, 59-60.

4a. Cf. above, p. 169.

4b. For a discussion on this point, cf. B. N. Banerji, *Bāṁlā Sāmayika Patra* (in Bengali), pp. 16-19; Collet, pp. 204-5; *Prabāsī*, 1347 B.S., Part II, pp. 654-59. According to some the editor of the paper was Ganga-kishor Bhattacharya. Both he and Hara-chandra were associated with the paper.

5. For further details, cf. Chapter V. Quotations from Vernacular papers are given in Ch. III. For a general account of Bengali papers. cf. B.N. Banerji, op. cit. For the English Papers, Cf. Barns.
6. Barns, 230.
7. For a short account of Haris-chandra Mukherji and the origin of the *Hindoo Patriot,* Cf. *Bengal Celebrities*, pp. 64-86.
8. *The Hindu Intelligencer*, 17 January, 1853; quoted by J.C. Bagal in the *Viśvabhāratī* (Bengali), Vol. X, part II, pp. 101-2.
9. Quoted by H.P. Ghose, op. cit., 25-6.
10. Dutt-II, 207.
11. Ibid.
12. Ibid, f. n., 2.
13. O'Malley, 191.
14. Ibid.
15. Vol. IX, pp. 936-7.
16. O'Malley, 196.
17. Ibid, 195.
18. Gleig, *Life of Munro*, II. 106-7.
19. O'Malley, 205. For the reasons advanced by Elphinstone in support of his views, cf. Barns, 134.
20. O'Malley, 196.
21. Ibid, 197.
22. Beveridge, III. 130.
23. Barns, 92-3.
24. Ibid, 94-101.
25. *Bengal Public Consultations*, Vol. 55, 17 October, 1822; No. 8 Minute.
26. Quoted in Dutt-II, 206-7.
27. *Rammohun*, 51.
28. For full text, cf. Barns, 115-9.
29. Collet, p. 177. The memorial was almost certainly drafted by Rammohan (ibid, 205-6).

30. Ibid, 180.
31. For the full text of the Appeal, cf. *Works*, 445-467.
31a. Collet, 180.
32. O'Malley, 198-99.
33. Ibid, 199.
34. Ibid, 198.
35. Ibid.
36. *CR*, 1908, January, p. 94.
37. Ibid, 102.
38. Ibid, 196; Barns, 273.
39. *CR*, 1908, January, 103-4.
40. Thornton, VI. 53.
41. Beveridge, III. 252.
42. Thornton, VI, 57.
43. Ibid, 61 ff.
44. B. Majumdar, 63.
45. Thornton, VI. 58.
46. Ibid, 62-3.
47. Barns, 250.
47a. Perhaps it is a mistake for lotus.
48. Barns, 249-50.
49. Ibid, 250.
50. For the text of the Act, cf. Barns, 252.
51. Ibid, 255.
52. This article is quoted in O'Malley, 213 ff.
53. Barns, 256.
54. Ibid, 257.
55. Ibid, 258-9.
56. Ibid, 256.
57. Cf. Ch. IX.
58. Quoted by J. C. Bagal in the *Peasant Revolution in Bengal*, pp. 49-50.
59. Barns, 269-70.
60. Ibid, 270.
61. Ibid, 274.
62. Ibid, 296.
63. Ibid, 277.
64. See p. 230.
65. Barns, 260.
66. Ibid, 261. A detailed account of the Hindī and Urdu papers is given by Prof. Garcin de Tassy in *La Langue et la Litterature Hindoustanies*, 1861, p. 172.
66a. *A Nation in Making*, pp. 46-7,
66b. The *Somaprakāśa* was first projected by Pandit Ishwar-chandra Vidyasagar, and the first number was probably written by him. "But he fell sick and made over the paper to Pandit Dwarakanath, under whose able management the paper attained the foremost place among the Bengalee newspapers." Dwarakanath "taught his native brethren of the journalism craft a new style of journalism" (*Hindoo Patriot*, 9 January, 1865). B.N. Banerji, op. cit., p. 247.
67. Barns, 303. For an account of the early history of the *Patrika* and quotations of extracts, cf. J. C. Bagal, *Bhāratvarsher Svādhīnatā* (Bengali).
68. Quoted in *Bhāratvarsher Svādhīnatā* by J.C. Bagal (Preface pp. 18-19).
69. Barns, 276.
70. The list of the papers is given by Barns (p. 272).
71. Barns, 273.
72. Ibid, 279-80.
73. Ibid, 281.
74. Ibid, 294.
75. H. P. Ghose, op. cit., 35.
76. Some of these press comments are reproduced by B.C. Pal (Pal-I, pp. 275-9) of which a few are quoted below as specimens.
77. Pal-I, 283-4.
78. Kelkar, N.C., *Life and Times of Tilak*, pp. 103 ff., 115.
79. Barns, 317.
80. Cf. Vol. IX, p. 739.
81. The passages from newspapers are quoted in *JIH*, XXXVIII, 599 ff.
82. The two letters of Lord Dufferin to Cross are quoted from the original documents.

CHAPTER VII (XLV)

SOCIAL REFORM

I. PRINCIPLES OF REFORM

The same rationalistic spirit which led to reforms in religion also sought to introduce reforms in social customs and manners. There were, at the beginning of the 19th century, numerous social evils of such a character as would rudely shock our sensibility at the present day. They were tolerated, partly out of veneration for old customs and partly out of sheer inertia. But the urge of a rational spirit which declared war against religious superstitions could ill brook the social evils which were eating into the vitals of the society. It was therefore in the very nature of things that the Brāhma Samāj under the leadership of young Keshab-chandra should take up the social reform as an integral part of its religious movement. Some account of this has been given above in Ch. IV. As noted there, this urge for social reforms was the cause of both the schisms that took place in quick succession in the Brāhma Samāj. These splits within its own rank and the consequent secession from the Hindu society made the Samāj a less effective instrument of reform among the Hindus.

The situation was very different in Bombay, because there the Prārthanā Samāj, the counterpart of Brāhma Samāj, followed an entirely different principle under the able leadership of Mahādev Govind Ranade, the leading social reformer of the 19th century. The spirit with which, under his guidance, the social reform movement was carried in Bombay may be best understood from Ranade's own words.[1] He welcomed the fact that —thanks to the wisdom of the Western Indian leaders of the Prārthanā Samāj movement—the schisms of Bengal in the Brāhma Samāj were not repeated in Bombay, and the supporters of the movement remained within the pale of their respective communities. Ranade said: "We do not want to break with the past and cease all connection with our society. We do not desire to give up our hold on the old established institutions". He was not, he said, "one of those who would abandon society because it tolerates what seems to them to be great evils". Ranade believed that "there was an ideal Hindu society in the old days but evils crept in during a period of depression, when in panic and weakness, a compromise was made with the brute forces of ignorance and superstition". To Ranade, therefore, reform was merely the work of liberating society from the restraints that were wrongfully imposed upon it. In support of this he pointed out that most of the evil customs which now prevailed in the Hindu society ran counter to the practices observed in the old times, and cited as instances the 'dependent status of women, infant marriage, prohibition of remarriage of widows, restriction of marriage within the narrow circle of the sub-caste to which one belonged, ignorance and seclusion (purdah) of women, prohibition of foreign travel, various kinds of abstentions enforced upon women, restrictions as to interdining among various castes, untouchability, etc.' These, according to Ranade, were innovations for which no *sastric* (scriptural) sanction could be pleaded. But he took care to add in a spirit of reverence for the old: "It may be, they were made with the best intentions. Admittedly they have failed to carry out these good intentions, if any, then entertained, and in seeking to upset them and restore the more healthy ideals they superseded, the reformers of the present day are not certainly open to the charge, that they are handling roughly our time-honoured institutions".

This was, no doubt, an attempt to pacify the orthodox section, and thus smooth down the path of reforms. But it was not long before Ranade realized that he had over-simplified the problem. If the antiquity of a social institution be the only criterion for its goodness or validity, then the door is thrown widely open for admitting many customs which are unacceptable, nay even revolting, to our modern taste. So when neo-Hinduism ushered in the extreme revivalist movement, Ranade realized the danger of the principle he had enunciated, and the rationalism in Ranade got the better of his traditionalism. The unwisdom of reviving old customs, simply because they were ancient, was the main theme of one of his addresses at the Social Conference. He said in a pathetic tone that "while the new religious sects condemn us for being too orthodox, the extreme orthodox section denounces us for being too revolutionary in our methods. According to these last, our efforts should be directed to revive, and not to reform. . . . . their watchword is that revival, and not reform, should be our motto. They advocate a return to the old ways, and appeal to the old authorities and the old sanction." Then, forgetting that he himself had encouraged the idea, he raised the very pertinent issue: 'What particular period of our history is to be taken as the old?' For, as he rightly pointed out, 'our usages have been changed from time to time, during the different periods represented by the Vedas, Smritis and the Puranas'. He turned the table completely against the revivalists by enumerating various abominable practices and immoral usages prevalent in India in the old days, and then asking them whether they were prepared to re-introduce them. "Shall we", asked he, "revive the twelve forms of sons, or eight forms of marriage......the *Niyoga* system......*Sati* and infanticide customs......?" Ranade then went on to argue that "if these usages were good and beneficial, why were they altered by our wise ancestors? If they were bad and injurious how can any claim be put forward for their restoration after so many ages?" He had evidently to contradict or bypass his earlier views, as he found that the sleeping giant of revivalism which he had awakened thereby proved too powerful for him. As a wiser but sadder man he concluded that "in a living organism as a society is, no revival is possible and reformation is the only alternative open to us".[2] He then proceeded to determine the principles on which this reformation must be based. The general principle enunciated by him was to root out those ideas and their outward forms which were responsible for the decline of the Hindus during the past three thousand years. Regarding the existing customs, the primary question was not whether they were sufficiently old, but whether they would altogether suit the changed circumstances of society. It meant, he proceeded to explain, that we must learn to be guided by our conscience, the wisdom of sages coming only to our aid and not to overpower us. In other words, Ranade came round to the view that the only basis of social reform was the real need of the country as rationally conceived. But whatever might have been the theoretical differences, all social reformers virtually agreed on the need of removing the concrete abuses or evils cited by Ranade, as mentioned above.

To this list Ranade himself added a few others which he supported with his whole heart but on which there was no such unanimity of views. These were purity-movement comprising anti-*nautch* (dancing) and temperance agitation, admission of converts from other faiths, and reduction in extravagant marriage expenses. Throughout the nineteenth century there was an active propaganda for social reform on these lines almost all over India, but more particularly in Bengal and Bombay. When the Indian National Congress was formed there was a proposal to make it a forum for discussing not only political but also social problems. For, according to a school of thought political advancement was not possible without social progress. The Congress, however, wisely it seems, restricted its sphere of work to politics only, and so in 1887 Ranade founded the Indian National Social Conference which met every year at the time of the Congress session, though entirely as a separate organization. He worked steadily, and not without some success against such glaring social evils as child-marriage, the purdah system, and the prohibition of widow-marriage.

The spirit of social reform in the nineteenth century cannot be judged merely by the concrete results it produced. The zeal with which the progressive section in society took up the various problems and launched series of campaigns against enormous odds is truly remarkable. How difficult such a task was would appear from the miserable plight of the pioneers of female education described in the last section of this chapter, and the violent opposition which was offered even by educated and highly placed men to the abolition of a cruel and inhuman rite like the *Sati*, mentioned in the next section. These two instances, among others, should make us realize the stiffness of opposition by the orthodox section against which the reformers had to carry on their struggle. And when we remember that the orthodox section, as is always the case, was backed up by the majority of the people and the best part of the material resources of the country, our admiration ought to increase for those small bands of social reformers who carried on almost a hopeless struggle throughout the nineteenth century at great personal sacrifice and not unoften at the risk of personal safety.

But orthodoxy was not the only obstacle to reformers. There was division in their own ranks regarding the method and speed of reforms. Some were so much carried away by their zeal that they would not brook any delay, nor refuse any means by which the object could be gained. Others were against sudden and violent changes and wanted to proceed more cautiously. This difference was clearly manifested on the specific issue of social legislation by the Government. It was welcomed by one party and opposed by the other. The nature of this difference may be illustrated by a concrete instance. In 1855 the Maharaja of Burdwan presented a petition to the Legislative Council setting forth the monstrous evils arising from the practice of unrestricted polygamy, specially among the *Kulins* of Bengal. The Lieutenant-Governor, Sir J. P. Grant, promised in 1857 to introduce a Bill on the subject; but the Mutiny stopped all further action, and also changed the attitude of the Government regarding social legislation. So when in 1863, several petitions were presented to the Government by nearly 21,000 Hindus in Bengal for the enactment of a law to restrain the abuses, the Governor-General in Council refused to introduce a Bill as recommended by the Government of Bengal, but advised it to appoint a Committee to review the situation. The Committee, appointed in 1866, included several eminent Indians and Europeans. They reported in 1867 to the effect that they could not suggest the enactment of any declaratory law or of any legislative measure that would suffice for the suppression of the abuse of polygamy. Even more important than this decision was the opinion expressed by two Indian members of the Committee, namely, Rama-nath Tagore and Digambar Mitra. They held that the evils had been too much exaggerated and were already on the decline, and that "this question may, without injury to public morals, be left for settlement to the good sense and judgment of the people." The third Indian member, Jay-krishna Mukherji, also held that the State should not interfere in the matter. Pandit Ishwar-chandra Vidyasagar was the only member to submit a note of dissent. He maintained that the evils were not greatly exaggerated and that the decrease of these evils was not sufficient to do away with the necessity of legislation. He was therefore in favour of passing a Declaratory Law. The Secretary of State decided against any legislation.[3]

The main issue thus raised in 1855 continued to agitate, and divide, Hindu society for the next fifty years. Eminent men like Bankim-chandra Chatterji in Bengal and B. G. Tilak in Bombay were definitely opposed to the idea of a foreign Government legislating on social matters. Ranade did not agree, and said, "that the force of this objection would be irresistible if the interference was of foreign initiation". He also enumerated the various advantages of legislation. It would be a change from the law of status to the law of contract, from the restraints of family and caste customs to the self-imposed restraints of the free will of the individual. It would also free social restrictions from the binding character of religious injunctions and liberate the national mind from the thraldom of superstitions.[4]

II. GENERAL REVIEW

It is somewhat singular that almost all the important social reforms of the nineteenth century should centre round women. The reason is not far to seek. The most important characteristic that marked the decadence of Hindu society was the gradual but steady degradation in the position of women and the lower castes, specially the untouchables. Both these features were eating into the vitality of the society and contributed not a little to the general degradation of the body-politic. It was inevitable, therefore, that the attention of the Indians should be drawn to these evils by the impact of western civilization, which held out a much higher ideal in both these respects. Of the two great evils, those associated with women claimed greater attention in the nineteenth century, while the other was to figure equally prominently in the twentieth.

The reason why the attention of the English-educated Indians was first drawn to the urgent necessity of reform in the status of women seems to be that it affected their own kith and kin whose vivid, real, and manifold miseries profoundly stirred their emotions as soon as they had freed their minds from the age-long shackles of superstition. The degrading position of women in Hindu society at the beginning of the nineteenth century was indeed most deplorable. It was a long tale of suffering and humiliation almost from birth to death. Among several tribes the birth of a girl was regarded as specially unfortunate, and they did not hesitate to kill them deliberately soon after they were born. The marriage of girls at an early age, long before puberty, and even sometimes when they were five to ten years old, if not earlier still, was the prevalent custom amongst the Hindus, with rare exceptions. This deprived the girls of any opportunity of receiving any education worth the name, and denied them altogether any say in the matter of selecting their partners in life. If the husband died, even when the wife was quite young or a baby, she was faced with the alternatives of either burning herself along with his dead body, or living a desolate and miserable life, most often as a neglected, if not hated, drudge in the family. For, beyond a bare maintenance, she had no right to the property of her dead husband, and could not marry again. But though the wife had no right to marry after the death of her husband, he could, and not unoften did, marry any number of wives, not only after her death but even during her lifetime. To carry on the household life with a number of co-wives was bad enough, but the lot of girls of certain classes, called *Kulins,* in Bengal—though fortunately limited in number—was far more pitiable, owing to strict restrictions which confined the choice of husband to a very limited number of families. Sometimes a large number of girls—fifty, sixty or even more—were married to one person. Cases are on record where a large number of *Kulin* girls, with ages varying from ten to sixty, and related as sisters, cousins, and aunts of varying degrees, were all married together at one and the same time, by one common nuptial ceremony, to an octogenarian on his death bed. Most of the *Kulin* girls, even when married, had to spend their lives in their fathers' home, for the husband could maintain only a few at a time in his own house, and the rest had to wait their turn as the common husband had to take several rounds to visit his numerous wives whose names and addresses he could find out only by reference to a written record. These tours were prompted by the regular honorarium paid to him by the wife he visited, or rather her relatives.

The greatest evil, from which the women suffered, was the denial of education, due partly to early marriage, and partly to a superstition that an educated woman was fated to become a widow. Still some women managed to get some education and ventilated their grievances through newspapers. Reference may be made in this connection to two remarkable letters published in the *Samāchāra-darpaṇa,* on 14 and 21 March, 1835.[5] The first was a communication sent in the name of a 'woman of Santipur,' a well-known locality in the Nadia District, Bengal. She depicts in pathetic language the sad plight of the widows and *Kulin* girls of Bengal who are denied the pleasure of living with their husbands unlike women of some other parts of the British territory. While the men may freely enjoy the company of concubines and whores with impunity, and still occupy honourable position in society, a woman is condemned if she visits a paramour. Reference is also made to the miserable diet and clothings prescribed for the widows. All these, it is contended, are against the Hindu scriptures, and an appeal is made to the British Government to do justice to women according to Hindu law and to prescribe as illegal the practice of keeping concubines.

The second letter, inspired by the first, was a communication in the name of the 'women of Chinsurah', about thirty miles from Calcutta. It is an appeal to their fathers and brothers against a number of specific evils or disqualifications which are put in the form of questions, serially numbered as follows:

1. Why are no arrangements made for our education as is done for the women of civilized countries?
2. Why are we not allowed to mix freely with other men and women like the women of other countries?
3. Why are we transferred like cattle, at the tender age of 4, 5, 10, or 12, to unknown men, who have no education, wealth or beauty, and denied the right of choosing our own husbands? To describe all the evil results of this system would be to create hatred against us. So we pray that we may be permitted to select our husbands under your general supervision.
4. Why in the name of marriage are you selling us to the highest bidders so that our husbands, who purchase us by money, regard us as mere chattels? The purchase money is not given to us as *strīdhana* but is enjoyed by you. Our rulers would commit crime in the eyes of God if they tolerate such abominable practices.
5. Why do you marry us to a person who has already many wives? Is it possible for a husband to do his duty to a number of wives?

6. If a husband may marry after the death of his wife, why is a wife debarred from marrying after her husband's death? Does not a woman possess the same desire for a conjugal life as a man? Can you prevent the evils arising from such unnatural laws?

The letter concludes with another appeal to the brothers and fathers to consider all these points and feel pity for the life of miserable slaves to which they have reduced the women, their own kith and kin.

These two letters might have been regarded as sufficient testimony for the awakening of women in Bengal, if they were really written by women. But it is just possible that they were the compositions of some men and sent in the name of women to evoke pity and sympathy. In any case, they put very pithily the many social evils which made the life of Bengali women wretched and miserable.

Such appeals, however, did not go in vain. Vigorous agitation was carried on by the English-educated Hindus, in the teeth of fierce opposition by the orthodox section, to spread education among women and to remove the evils, referred to above, from which they were suffering. The reformers were partially successful in their efforts. Education was promoted among women, female infanticide and *Sati* were prohibited, and widow-remarriage was legalised, as will be related in the following sections. Efforts to stop polygamy were not equally successful, though its rigours, such as are illustrated by *Kulinism,* were considerably minimised by the spread of education and liberal ideas during the nineteenth century. It is to be noted that while Ishwar-chandra Vidyasagar put forth his efforts and energy to prohibit the evil of polygamy he was opposed by men like Bankim-chandra Chatterji, the great, if not the greatest, Bengali writer, the apostle of nationalism, and the author of the *Vande-mātaram* hymn. Certainly Bankim-chandra was not averse to social reforms, but it is apparent that even some of the English-educated and most advanced Indian thinkers of the nineteenth century were very much against the principle of abolishing social abuses like polygamy by legislation.[6] They were of opinion that spread of western education and the resulting social enlightenment, perhaps aided by economic causes, would slowly eradicate the evils. This has not proved to be a forlorn hope, for polygamy, declared illegal in independent India, certainly fell into disfavour and disuse, and a strong moral force was silently operating against it, even at the end of the period under review. The gradual abolition of child-marriage has followed a similar process.

The same thing may be said of another evil system, viz., purdah or seclusion of women. This custom, more strictly observed by the Muslims all over India, and probably borrowed by the Hindus from them in Medieval age, was prevalent among the high class Hindus of Northern India, but unknown in the Deccan and South India where the Muslim influence was less enduring and smaller in its extent. This long-standing practice was denounced by reformist sects like the Brāhma Samāj and practically renounced by them, though by degrees. Their precept and example in this respect as well as in promoting education among women, remarriage of widows, abolition of child-marriage and polygamy, and in general improvement of the status and position of women, contributed largely to similar reforms within the Hindu society. Though the Brāhma Samāj is no longer a living force in Bengal, it has left a rich legacy of these and other social reforms, such as abolition of the rigours of caste distinctions, sanction of sea-voyage, interdining with lower castes and non-Hindus, removal of restrictions about forbidden food and drink etc. These reforms were effected gradually and almost imperceptibly, and only their beginning could be noticed at the end of the period under review. But the progress of western education and western ideas completed or accelerated the process that was initiated under the influence of non-conforming religious sects like the Brāhma Samāj, Ārya Samāj and others.

Although the social reforms in Bengal in the nineteenth century centred mainly round the improvement of women's condition, the miserable state of the lower classes was not altogether lost sight of. The abolition of slavery and slave trade, to which detailed reference will be made in a later section, was an important landmark in the history of social reforms in India. Two legislations of 1849 are also deserving of notice. By these the abominable practice of branding convicts was abolished, and provision was made for the custody of lunatics.[6a]

There was a strenuous campaign against drunkenness, an evil which assumed serious proportions both among the high and the low, and the rich and the poor. Temperance societies were established, tracts were written, and some of the best Bengali dramatists wrote satires to condemn the evils.

The social reformers directed their attention to the suppression of many cruel rites and practices performed in the name of religion. The more important of these will be referred to in the subsequent sections. An instance of minor ones may be referred to here. In 1865-7 newspaper articles strongly condemned the Hindu practice of taking sick people to the banks of the Ganges to die, and of immersing the lower half of his body in the water of the river, which was believed to hasten or even to cause many deaths. The Government was approached to stop this evil by legislation. The Government of Bengal, unwilling to prohibit the practice altogether, proposed to regulate it by requiring that in every such case a notice should be given to the police in the form of a declaration signed by the nearest relatives of the sick man to the effect that there was no reasonable hope of his recovery. The Government of India, however, vetoed this proposal with the concurrence of the Secretary of State.[7]

In Bombay the agitation for social reform started earlier than in Bengal, and was not an offshoot of movement for religious reform. This is due to the fact that the Maratha rulers of the 18th century followed the old Hindu tradition of regulating social affairs, and showed a reforming spirit in certain directions, such as "readmission to Hinduism of converts, intermarriage, the enforcement of temperance, the remarriage of girls who had been engaged or informally married by force or fraud, and the prohibition of sale of girls. Instances of excommunication being set aside by the State were not unknown."[7a] This tradition exercised some influence upon the society even after the establishment of British rule in Bombay. Even as far back as the 1830's Gangadhar Shastri Jambhekar and Jagannath Shankershet carried on a campaign for taking back Christian converts into Hindu society. Out of their efforts grew the Hindu Missionary Society started by Gajananrao Vaidya to re-admit converts into Hindu society. Organized efforts were made during the forties to fight social inhibitions, particularly those associated with the caste system. A society called Paramahaṁsa Sabhā was founded in 1849 with this object in view. It was a sort of secret association, at whose meetings members partook of food cooked by persons of low caste and consumed forbidden food and drink.

The establishment of the Prārthanā Samāj on the model of the Brāhma Samāj of Bengal gave a great impetus to social reform, as mentioned above.[7b] Reference has already been made to the views and activities of Mahadev Govind Ranade who started an all-India movement for social reform. There were several other eminent social reformers in Bombay. One of them, Jotiba Phule, took up the cause of women and down-trodden masses. In 1851 he started a girls' school in Poona with the assistance of his wife. Undaunted by the harassment of the society he opened a school for the children of the depressed classes and helped the widows to remarry. As a result he and his wife were driven out of the house by his father. Perhaps this drove him to excess. His campaign for the removal of untouchability and the social and economic regeneration of the depressed classes soon developed into an anti-Brahmin movement. He boldly challenged the age-long leadership of the Brahmins and sought to instill courage, enthusiasm and self-reliance among the masses. His attitude was one of social revolt against the domination of the Brahmin caste in all spheres of social and political life in Maharashtra. He championed the cause of villagers and propagated social reform among them. He founded the Satya-Shodak Samāj with the object of extirpating the Brahmins.[7c]

Reference should also be made to Karsondas Mulji, a young Bania student, who was driven from his home for writing a tract in support of widow remarriage. In addition to his efforts to popularise this reform he set an example by refusing to perform expiatory rites after his return from England. But his most vigorous and successful campaign was directed against the Vaishṇava-Vallabh community to which he himself belonged. The spiritual heads of the community, called Mahārājas, indulged in debauchery and licentiousness, and took liberty with the women of the community. Karsondas denounced these practices and wrote: "No other sectaries have ever perpetrated such shamelessness, subtlety, immodesty, rascality and deceit as has the sect of the Maharajas". After he wrote in this strain for about a month the Mahārāja brought a libel suit against him. His plea of justification was accepted and the trial judge was fervent in his appreciation of Karsondas's courage and public spirit.[7d]

Another well-known social reformer was Paṇḍitā Ramābāi. She travelled all over India, married a Bengali, and became a widow. 'Her denunciation of men for keeping women down, her marriage out of caste, and her criticism of popular Hinduism roused the orthodox section against her, though they admired her scholarship and eloquence'. She started the Ārya Mahilā Samāj in Poona but met with little success. 'Piqued at the attitude of her countrymen, she turned to the Christian missionaries and, after spending three years in England and America, returned to Poona with promise of financial support for educational work. She became a Christian and started the Sāradā Sadan in 1889. Though Ranade and R. G. Bhandarkar sympathised with her, Tilak denounced her for engaging in conversion under the garb of imparting education. Ultimately she openly admitted the proselytising character of the Sāradā Sadan and both Bhandarkar and Ranade cut off their association with her activities.[7e]

The rise of Neo-Hinduism or Hindu Revivalism[7f] slowed down the progress of social reform to a certain extent towards the end of the 19th century. But the activities of the Ārya Samāj kept up the tempo in the Punjab. The clarion call of Vivekananda to remove the excrescences while retaining the essential spirit of Hinduism, particularly his passionate appeal against untouchability and in favour of the uplift of women and the masses, gave a new vigour to the spirit of reform.[7g]

It is worthy of note that by the end of the 19th century the spirit of social reform was in evidence in almost all the Provinces of India which had hitherto been lukewarm in this respect.[7h] The spirit also seized some rulers of the Indian States, particularly those of Mysore, Baroda and Travancore. The Mysore Government passed a law "to put down marriages of girls under 12 and prevent unequal marriages between men over 45 and girls below 14."[7i] An Act passed in Baroda fixed the minimum age of marriage at 12 for girls and 16 for boys.[7j] Association for the promotion of social reform sprang up all over India.

In conclusion it may be added that if we take a broad and general view and compare the state of Hindu society at the beginning of the 19th century with that at its end, the reforms, accomplished by legislation as well as silent process of evolution, cannot be regarded as either inadequate or unsatisfactory. Apart from what has been said above, or will be stated later in this chapter, attention may be drawn to the state of society in South India which Abbe Dubois witnessed with his own eyes towards the close of the eighteenth century. He refers to polyandry among the Nairs in Malabar coast and the custom among the Tolyas in Madura of brothers, uncles, and nephews having a common wife. In the Carnatic hills men and women did not wash their clothes till they wore away by use. Among a caste in Eastern Mysore the mother, giving her eldest daughter in marriage, had to puncture two of her fingers. The respect due from the Śūdras to the Brāhmaṇas, and from women to men, was shown by uncovering the upper part of the body of the inferior, even of a woman, before a man of the superior class. Reference is made to barren women who took vows to get children by resorting to the most abominable practices; and also to procession in which the images of gods and goddesses were made to mimic obscene gestures to one another. Sincere devotion in many temples took the form of such cruel practices as walking on burning fire, hook-swinging (to be described later), piercing the cheeks and the lips or the tongue with iron rods or silver wire.[8]

All these shocking customs[9] which prevailed at the beginning of the nineteenth ceutury[10] were either altogether abolished or were in a process of steady decline by the beginning of the twentieth. The notorious system of Devadāsīs[11] was also gradually declining.

Abbe Dubois further mentions that thousands of Hindus and Christians were converted by Tipu Sultān, but whereas the Christians were reconverted to Christianity, the Hindus were refused readmission within the fold of Hinduism, even though they applied for it and their case was backed by the Brahmin Government of Poona. The *Śuddhi* movement, supported by social reformers like Ranade and included as a chief item in the programme of the Ārya Samāj, shows the advance made in respect of this glaring evil in course of the nineteenth century. Another evil noticed by Abbe Dubois was that those among the Hindus who practised such fine arts as music, sculpture, and painting were looked upon as even lower than Śūdras. There has been a great change of view in this respect. On the whole, while the well-wishers and reformers of the Hindu society at the end of the 19th century were fully justified in complaining that much still remained to be done, every impartial critic is bound to admit that the advance already accomplished in a century fully entitled it to the credit of being a progressive society.

III. SATI

The most important social legislation in the nineteenth century was the abolition of the cruel rite of the *Sati,* i.e. the burning of the widow on the funeral pyre of her husband.[12] The nature and antiquity of this practice have been noted above.[13] The inhuman cruelty involved in the practice drew the attention of Muslim rulers. According to Ferishta, Sikandar, a bigoted King of Kashmir at the beginning of the fifteenth century, prohibited the performance of *Sati.* But his liberal-minded son, Zain-ul-'Ābidīn restored the religious rite to the Hindus.[14] In 1510 Albuquerque had prohibited *Sati* in Goa. Mughul Emperors like Akbar and Jahangir also forbade the practice but were unable to enforce their order beyond the neighbourhood of Delhi. The Peshwa Baji Rao discouraged the practice.[15] The persistence of such an inhuman practice for more than two thousand years only demonstrates how religious superstitions can deaden absolutely all rational instincts and human feelings even among a highly civilized people. The Spartan practice of making the helots shooting targets, the gladiatorial fights in Rome, and the burning of Christian heretics in Europe during the Medieval age, and even later, testify to the universality of the strange spectacle of inhumanity flourishing side by side with high intellectual and moral development in a society.

The idea behind the practice of *Sati* would be clear from the following passage in Colebrooke's *Digest of Hindu Law,* an authoritative manual of Hindu Law prepared by the Government with the help of learned Brahmins. "No other effectual duty is known for virtuous women at any time after the deaths of their lords, except casting themselves into the same fire." According to this Digest, failure of a widow to do this duty might lead to her rebirth as animals, while its faithful observance would not only enable her to 'enjoy delight with her husband' for eternity but also expiate the sins of her husband's maternal and paternal ancestors up to three generations.

The British Government had given a clear undertaking that they would preserve the existing laws of both the Hindus and the Muslims, and would protect them in the free exercise of their religion. The Government of Bengal did not, therefore, like to interfere even when they were strongly urged to do so by their own officials. The Madras Government followed suit; the Bombay Government did not, at first, tolerate this practice but, after the annexation of Peshwa's dominions, adopted the policy of neutrality, and even passed a regulation to the effect that 'assistance at the rite of self-immolation known as *Sati*, was not murder.'[16]

But Europeans, unfettered by any obligation to maintain neutrality in religious affairs, refused to tolerate such inhuman practice. The Supreme Court in Calcutta, the Danes at Serampore, the Dutch at Chinsura, and the French at Chandernagore prohibited the practice within their jurisdiction. But this did not go very far to minimise the evil. For the rites were performed just outside the jurisdiction of the city, sometimes even in its suburbs.

As far back as 1789 English district officers wrote to the Supreme Government asking for permission to disallow a practice at which human nature shudders. But the Government, true to the principle of neutrality, gave directions to their officers to confine their laudable efforts to dissuasion and not to adopt any coercive measures. Though this method proved occasionally successful, particularly when the party approached the authorities for permission, the evils were too wide-spread to be seriously affected by such measures. According to a census report of the Christian missionaries at Serampore, in 1804 no less than three hundred cases occurred in six months within a radius of 30 miles from Calcutta.[17]

The voluntary self-immolation by a widow, though sanctioned by religion, was inhuman in itself, but the *Sati* was rendered more abominable by the manner in which it was often performed. There is no doubt that many widows, hardened by religious superstitions, or influenced by other considerations, voluntarily sacrificed themselves, and their grim resolve, undeterred by horrors of physical pain, deaf to all entreaties of dear and near ones, and unshaken by earnest persuasion of all kinds, extorts a sort of admiration. But there is equally little doubt that many cases, perhaps a large majority, did not fall under this category. In not a few instances a young widow was reported to have made the choice under duress, pressure being put upon her by her relatives, who either hoped to secure vicarious renown for virtue and piety for the family, or, worse still, wanted to get rid of her for serving their material interests. It became also almost a normal practice to take good care to see that once an unfortunate widow made the fatal choice, she could not escape the cruel fate even if she wished to do so. In not a few cases she was even drugged for the same purpose, and her body on the funeral pyre was pressed down by bamboo poles.

It was natural that protests against such practices would be strong and numerous. The Government, in spite of its pledge of neutrality, could not remain unmoved. In a letter dated 5th February, 1805, Wellesley referred the matter to the Nizāmat Ādālat. The judges of this Ādālat consulted the Hindu *Paṇḍits* and forwarded their views to the Government. The *Paṇḍits* held that widows, excepting certain categories (such as pregnant, under the age of puberty, or with infants without any one else to take care of them), would, by burning themselves along with their husbands, contribute to the happiness of both themselves and their husbands in the next world. The *Paṇḍits*, however, clearly laid down that it was contrary to law and customs to drug or intoxicate a woman in order to induce her to become a *Sati*. In forwarding these opinions the judges of the Nizāmat Ādālat advised that the *Sati* could be abolished in many areas where it was rarely practised, and regulated in others according to the recommendations of the *Paṇḍits*. But they held that a general order for the wholesale abolition of the practice would offend the religious susceptibilities of the Hindus.[18]

Seven years passed before the Government took any action on the lines of the recommendation of the *Paṇḍits*. Orders were issued in 1812 (though not circulated till 1813) prohibiting intoxication, drugging, or any other means to induce a widow to become a *Sati* against her will. This was supplemented by two other sets of instructions circulated in 1815 and 1817. By these the district magistrates were to send annual returns of the cases of *Sati*, and the relatives were required to give previous intimation of impending *Sati* to the Police; further, certain categories of widows were declared ineligible for becoming *Sati*. All these orders were issued to the Government officers through the Nizāmat Ādālat.[19]

While these orders did little good, they indirectly seemed to indicate the approval of the Government in those cases of *Sati* which did not fall under the restrictive clauses. Protests became stronger every day, particularly on the ground that the statistics proved the *Sati* to be a more or less local custom rather than a part of the general Hindu Law. The figures for the years 1815-17 showed that as against 864 cases in five districts of Bengal alone, there were only 663 cases in the rest of British India. The Court of Directors also took a serious view of the situation and wrote on June 17, 1823, that they felt very doubtful whether the measures already taken "have not tended rather to increase than to diminish this practice", and they consented, only with much reluctance, "to make the British Government, by specific permission of the suttee, an ostensible party to the sacrifice." The Court of Directors proceeded even further and added: "We are averse also to the practice of making British courts expounders and vindicators of the Hindu religion when it leads to acts which not less as legislators than as Christians we abominate."

Lord Amherst stated the views of his Government in a letter he wrote to the Court of Directors on December 3, 1824: "Nothing but the apprehension of evils infinitely greater than those arising from the existence of the practice should induce us to tolerate it for a day." It is on record that both the Marquess of Hastings and Lord Amherst feared that the abolition of *Sati* by legislation would spread disaffection in the Bengal army. Subsequent events showed that such a fear cannot be regarded as absolutely groundless.[20]

A further reason, which induced the Government of India to 'go slow' in the matter, in spite of vigorous protests on all sides, was their belief that with the progress of knowledge and English education, the Indians themselves would condemn the practice of *Sati*, and then the abolition of this practice would be safe and expedient. The Marquess of Hastings, Lord Amherst and many others fondly believed that such a day would not be long in coming.[21]

This idea was not without some justification. For a sense of moral indignation was being slowly roused in the minds of the Indians themselves against this horrible and cruel rite. In this matter, as in so many others, Raja Rammohan Roy was in the forefront of the cry for reforms. He worked with his whole heart and soul for the abolition of this horrid rite, and devoted his whole energy for the purpose. When the orthodox Hindus of Calcutta sent a petition to the Government for the repeal of the orders issued in 1812, 1815, and 1817, Rammohan and his followers submitted a counter-petition in August, 1818, narrating gruesome details, connected with the practice, in the following words:

"Your petitioners are fully aware, from their own knowledge and from the authority of credible eye-witnesses, that cases have frequently occurred where women have been induced by the persuasions of their next heirs, interested in their destruction, to burn themselves on the funeral piles of their husbands; that others who have been induced by fear to retract a resolution, rashly expressed in the first moments of grief, of burning with their deceased husbands, have been forced upon the pile, and there bound down with ropes and pressed with green bamboos until consumed by the flames; that some, after flying from the flames, have been carried back by their relations and burnt to death. All these instances, your petitioners humbly submit, are murders according to every Shastra as well as to the commonsense of all nations."[22]

Rammohan also wrote tracts in Bengali to convince the people that the horrid practice of *Sati* was not only inhuman, but also lacked the sanction of the *Śāstras.* Some of these tracts were in extensive circulation and also translated into English. They were written in the form of disputes between an advocate and an opponent of the practice in which the former's position was shown to be untenable.[23] Rammohan also carried on a vigorous campaign against *Sati* through his journal *Sambāda-Kaumudī.* He was violently opposed by the orthodox Hindus led by Raja Radha-kanta Dev, and it is stated on reliable authority, that "for a time Rammohan's life was in danger."[24] But the undaunted champion of the righteous cause pursued his course with unflagging zeal and industry, and succeeded in winning over a considerable section of the Hindus on his side. Bishop Heber refers to Dr. Marshman's remark in 1824 that "the Brahmins have no longer the power and popularity which they had when he first remembers India, and among the laity many powerful and wealthy persons agree, and publicly express their agreement, with Rammohan Roy in reprobating the custom".[24a]

Lord William Bentinck came out to India as Governor-General with instructions from the Court of Directors to "consider definite measures for the immediate or gradual abolition of *Sati.*" There is no doubt that the Directors were influenced by the wave of liberalism in England which swept away, in recent times, many abuses of long standing. Bentinck, "a reformer by temperament," was also under this influence, and lost no time in taking up the question in right earnest. He appreciated the effect that knowledge and education were slowly producing by way of diminishing the cases of *Sati,* but he thought that the influence of these factors was mostly limited to upper classes in Calcutta and was not likely to extend to the population at large. But before taking any definite action he instituted a confidential inquiry to ascertain the views of civil and military officers. Of the 49 military officers to whom he wrote on the subject, 24 supported total and immediate suppression of the rite, 20 were in support of abolition by indirect means, and 5 were opposed to interference of any kind with the practice. The Superintendent of Police and nine-tenths of the public functionaries in the interior were in favour of abolition. Of the 15 civil servants consulted by Bentinck 8 were in favour of immediate abolition. All the five judges of the Nizāmat Ādālat were also in favour of immediate abolition.[25]

Opposition, however, came from the most unexpected quarters. H. H. Wilson, a reputed oriental scholar, as well as Raja Rammohan Roy, advised Bentinck against any legislation to prohibit the practice of *Sati.* Raja Rammohan had a "constitutional aversion to coercion",[26] and, in view of the experience he had already gained by his vigorous agitation against *Sati,* seemed to prefer steady pursuit of persuasive methods to any sudden innovation caused by legislation. He expressed the opinion that the "practice might be suppressed quietly and unobservedly by increasing the difficulties and by the indirect agency of the police".[27] Wilson was probably also of the same view, and both of them feared that abolition by legislation would cause general distrust and dissatisfaction.

But Bentinck had decided upon his course of action. On November 8, 1829, he laid an elaborate minute before his Council.[28] Referring to the apprehensions of danger from popular outbreak, he pointed out by quoting figures that the *Sati* was mostly prevalent in Bengal, Bihar and Orissa, the majority being in Calcutta Division. He then observed that among the people of these districts "so great is the want of courage and of vigour of character, and such the habitual submission of centuries, that insurrection or hostile opposition to the will of the ruling power may be affirmed to be an impossible danger." There would have been less assurance of safety, he said, if the practice were largely prevalent among the bold and manly people of Upper Provinces. Bentinck was satisfied from the replies he received from the army officers that there would be no trouble in the army if the *Sati* were prohibited. He therefore confidently hoped that the Council would share his own views about the expediency and safety of the abolition.

Sir Charles Metcalfe, one of the most distinguished servants of the Company and the most prominent member of the Council, expressed the fear that the proposed measure might possibly be "used by the disaffected and designing to inflame the passions of the multitude and produce a religious excitement." He, however, thought of such a danger only in immediate future, and if there were no insurrection in the early period of its operation, he did not believe that it would cause any danger later on. But in spite of such misgivings Metcalfe concurred with the proposal of the Governor-General, and the Council unanimously recorded: "We are decidedly in favour of an open, avowed and general prohibition, resting altogether upon the goodness of the act and our power to enforce it."[29]

"On 4 December, 1829, *Sati* was declared by Regulation XVII to be illegal in the Bengal Presidency and punishable by the criminal courts. Persons assisting a voluntary sacrifice would be deemed guilty of culpable homicide; but those convicted of using violence or compulsion or assisting in burning or burying a Hindu widow in a state of stupefaction or in circumstances impeding the exercise of her free will, would be liable to sentence of death. A similar regulation was passed in Madras on 2 February, 1830. In Bombay Sir John Malcolm's Government repealed that clause in their regulations which declared 'assistance at the rites of self-immolation not to be murder'."[30]

The promulgation of the Regulation was not followed by any popular outbreak or disaffection in the army. But the orthodox Hindus did not give up the battle as lost. On December 19, 1829, a petition for the annulment of the New Regulation was presented to Lord Bentinck. The signatories, consisting of 800 inhabitants of Calcutta, included many Zamindars and notable leaders of the Hindu community. Lord Bentinck met a deputation of their leaders—Raja Radha-kanta Dev, Maharaja Kali-krishna Bahadur and others—on January 14, 1830, and informed them that if they disputed his interpretation of Hindu Law, they might appeal to the King-in-Council. On the other hand, another public petition, of which Raja Rammohan was "the reputed and probable author," was sent, on January 16. to the Governor-General thanking him for his kind measure. It was signed by 300 Indians including Rammohan.[31] A meeting was held in the Government House, Calcutta, where a renowned *Paṇḍit* spoke against the *Sati* before an audience of more than 600.

The orthodox party sent an appeal to the King-in-Council. Rammohan also prepared a counter-petition[32] and carried it with him when he went to England. He presented it to the House of Commons and was himself present when the Privy Council dismissed the appeal of the orthodox party. Thus the curtain fell at last on a long-drawn tragic drama, and on an age-long superstition inflicting the agony of death on thousands of innocent Hindu women in the name of religion.

Though occasional cases of *Sati* were reported even after the passing of Regulation XVII, particularly outside British India, gradually the practice disappeared with the spread of knowledge and under the influence of the new age of reason and reforms.

In conclusion it should be noted that sometimes the widows were buried alive with the dead bodies of their husbands. According to a report of the Superintendent of Police, Lower Province, submitted in 1815, six widows of the Jugi community were buried alive with their dead husbands in the District of Tippera during three years.[32a] As noted above, Regulation XVII of 1829, prohibited the cremation as well as the burial of the widows, with their dead husbands.

IV. INFANTICIDE

Another cruel and horrible rite which was abolished in the nineteenth century by the strenuous and unwearied exertions of the British officials was the practice of killing infant girls. Its victims were far larger in number than the *Sati,* and in cruelty and inhumanity the two differed only in degree, and not in kind. But infanticide drew less public attention because the crime was perpetrated in privacy, and was confined to a few tribes.

Unlike *Sati* the practice of killing infant girls had no real or fancied religious sanction behind it. It came into vogue as a rough and ready solution of a social problem. Social usage among certain Rājput tribes prohibited intermarriage between families of the same clan or tribe, and social customs and conventions demanded a very heavy expenditure on the marriage ceremony. The problem of suitably marrying the daughter was therefore a difficult one. But failure to marry a daughter not only involved a heavy social disgrace but also violated religious injunctions. In order to nip the difficulty in the bud, the practice gradually grew, among certain tribes, of killing the girl almost immediately after her birth. This was mainly effected in two ways. Either the mother deliberately neglected to suckle the child, or administered poisonous drug(mostly opium) to the nipple of her breast. But cases are on record where other and more direct methods were employed. Maharaja Dalip Singh, son of Ranjit Singh, said that "he had actually seen when he was a child at Lahore, his sisters put into a sack and thrown into the river".[33] But such instances were probably very rare, and were more akin to the practice, prevalent in Bengal, of throwing children (both male and female) into the sacred river Gaṅgā, in fulfilment of religious vows. This practice was prohibited in British India by Regulation VI of 1802.

The infanticide proper, as described above, came into notice as far back as 1789. The practice was in vogue among two Rājput tribes in the province of Varanasi (Banaras), known as Rajkumar and Rajbansi. Although Bengal Regulation XXI of 1795 and Regulation III of 1804 declared such infanticide to be murder, the inhuman practice continued almost unchecked. Ere long it was found that infanticide was widely prevalent among the Jharija (Jadeja) Rājputs in Cutch and Gujarat. It was estimated that nearly twenty thousand female infants were destroyed every year by the 1,25,000 Jharija families of what now constitutes the State of Gujarat. It was also reported that infanticide was practised among the Rāṭhor Rājputs of Jaipur and Jodhpur as well as by the Jats and Mewatis.[34]

Several British officials—notably Duncan and Walker—distinguished themselves by unceasing efforts to induce, by persuasion, the abandonment of this horrid practice. But though Rajkumars and Jharijas gave written undertakings to discontinue the practice, it continued as usual. The Government of India as well as the Court of Directors took up the question seriously, and Lord Hardinge did all in his power to put down the crime in the Native States. But the difficulty of detecting a crime, practised in utmost privacy, baffled the varied and sustained efforts of a number of British officials. The British military officials who served as Political Agents in Native States also brought pressure upon their rulers to eradicate the evil. The strenuous exertions of all these, aided by various preventive measures and a general awakening of a rational spirit through the spread of Western education, ultimately bore fruit. The crime steadily declined in the second half of the nineteenth century. Still, as a measure of precaution, an Act was passed in 1870 which enabled the authorities to enforce 'compulsory' registration of births, and regular verification of the existence of female children for some years after birth, within the areas where infanticide once prevailed.[35]

V. REMARRIAGE OF WIDOWS

Another important landmark in the gradual amelioration in the lot of Hindu women was the legalisation of remarriage of widows. It would appear from what has been said above,[36] that Hindu Law permitted a widow, under certain contingencies, to marry again, and her issue by the second marriage was recognized as a legitimate heir. This law and practice, however, gradually came into disuse, and the remarriage of widows, at least among higher classes, came to be rigidly prohibited in the Medieval age. But, as in the case of *Sati*, the iniquity of the practice drew the attention of social reformers during the pre-British period.

The last notable effort to introduce remarriage of Hindu widows was made by Rājā Rājballabh of Dacca, a distinguished political figure at the time of Sirāj-ud-daulā. Anxious to remarry his widowed daughter he referred the matter to the learned *Paṇḍits* all over India, and they accorded their sanction to the custom on the strength of the well-known verse occurring in many Smṛiti texts which runs as follows:—"A second husband is permitted to women whose (first) husband is lost (i.e., unheard of) or dead or has become an ascetic, or an outcaste."[37] But in spite of religious sanction, the customs and usages proved to be too strong and Rājballabh's efforts proved unsuccessful.

With the growth of Western education, and of the rational spirit it brought in its train, the question was seriously discussed. The reforming sects like Brāhma Samāj introduced remarriage of widows in their societies, and this had a great repercussion on the orthodox Hindu society as well. The abolition of the *Sati* in 1829 gave a fillip to this movement, and it is gratifying to note that Hindu women themselves wrote to the press demanding reforms of this and other evils from which they were suffering.[38] Some time before 1837, a few public men of Calcutta proposed to call a meeting in order to encourage female education and remove the restrictions regarding widow-remarriage. The Calcutta Press took up the cause of the widow. About the same time an agitation for this reform was set up in Bombay. Several pamphlets on the subject were published in or about 1837 and there was an inquiry by the Bombay Government to elicit the views of its officers and the *Paṇḍits* on the question.

The agitation which was set up in the thirties continued throughout the forties, and a few Indians set the example by marrying widows. In 1845 the British Indian Society sounded the two religious associations, the *Dharma Sabhā* and the *Tattva-bodhinī Sabhā*, but found no support or encouragement from any of them. This was a foretaste of the great storm that burst out in Hindu society when Pandit Ishwar-chandra Vidyasagar, a renowned Sanskrit scholar and Principal of the Sanskrit College, Calcutta, took up the question in right earnest. He wrote a series of articles and pamphlets in defence of widow-remarriage and sent a petition, signed by 987 persons, to the Government of India. The orthodox party sent a counter-petition signed by 36,763 persons. The opposition against him reached such an alarming stage that his life was thought to be in danger. But, nothing daunted, he went on educating the people and the Government, and it was mainly through his unwearied efforts that the Hindu Widow's Remarriage Act (Act XV of 1856) was passed on July 26, 1856. It legalises the marriages of widows notwithstanding any custom or interpretation of the Hindu Law to the contrary, and declares that the children of such marriages are legitimate.

In spite of the Act, the remarriage of Hindu widows did not make any substantial progress. Pandit Ishwar-chandra Vidyasagar in Bengal and Vishnu Sastri in Western India put their heart and soul in propagating this reform. A Widow Remarriage Association was started in Bombay in 1866. But the actual number of widows remarried under the new Act was quite inconsiderable.

Reference should be made in this connection to the laudable organized efforts made by several eminent persons to improve the lot of the Hindu widows. Professor D. K. Karve founded the Widows' Home in Poona in 1896, and two years later Veeresalingam Pantulu founded a similar Home in Madras. Both of them literally begged from door to door to establish the Homes in their own buildings, and spent many years of their lives in popularising the remarriage of widows. Sasipada Banerji also set up a Home in Calcutta, but it was closed down in 1901.[38a]

VI. SLAVERY

Slavery was a recognized institution in India since remote antiquity.[39] But the treatment of slaves in India differed remarkably from that accorded to them in ancient Greece or Rome or to Negro slaves in more recent times. This is probably the reason why the Greek ambassador Megasthenes reported that slavery was unknown in India. That this humane spirit generally prevailed also in modern times may be gathered from the following observation in 1772 by the Committee of Circuit in support of a regulation which condemned the families of convicted *dacoits* (robbers and brigands) to be sold as slaves:

> "The ideas of slavery, borrowed from our American colonies, will make every modification of it appear in the eyes of our countrymen in England a horrible evil. But it is far otherwise in this country; here slaves are treated as the children of the families to which they belong and often acquire a much happier state by their slavery than they could have hoped for by the enjoyment of liberty."[40]

This may be, generally speaking, true of slaves in Indian families, but contemporary references indicate that lots of many slaves must have been quite miserable. The branding of slaves' foreheads with red-hot iron rod was not unknown. The slaves were harshly treated by many Europeans, and, according to contemporary accounts, were often whipped even for minor offences. There are cases on record that the English ladies themselves whipped, even their men slaves, with their own hands. There were regular whipping houses in Calcutta which charged one anna for each lashing. The slaves themselves had to carry to these houses slips from their masters indicating the number of lashes to be inflicted on them, together with the fee. The slaves were tied to the stocks and flogged fifteen to twenty times, and many fell down unconscious. Even more severe was the treatment of the run-away slaves who were caught. A woman slave of one Mr. Anderson was recaptured and brought before a Magistrate, who ordered her to be flogged ten times before being returned to her master.[40a]

In a letter dated 18 January, 1823, Leicester Stanhope made a passionate appeal to the Duke of Gloucester to abolish slavery in India. He refers to the slaves in North India as mostly domestic servants or kept by prostitutes for immoral profession, and those in South India as mostly engaged in cultivation. In Kanara alone there were no less than 16,000 slaves. The purchase-price of a slave is mentioned by him as follows: Four to fifteen rupees for a boy; sixteen to twenty-four rupees for a woman; twenty-four to one hundred and sixty rupees for an adult man.[40b]

In general, the slaves who served as domestic servants comprised mostly persons who had voluntarily offered themselves or their children for sale in times of scarcity, as the only alternative to starvation by death. In many cases, though not perhaps in all, such children were restored to their parents when better times came. It is on record that grown-up girls were sold by their parents as slaves, and the debtors and gamblers sold even their wives, sometimes for a paltry amount. The rich and aristocrats as well as European settlers in Calcutta bought the female slaves to serve as concubines. A large number was, however, reduced to slavery in more dubious ways. The Regulation about the enslavement of the wives and children of the dacoits (brigands), referred to above, was passed in the first year of Warren Hastings's rule in Bengal. We also hear of children, and sometimes even adults, being stolen or forcibly seized by regular gangs employed by slave-traders. There was a regular trade in slaves, though not on a very large scale, and both Indians and Europeans were involved in this lucrative but nefarious business.

Boats filled with child-slaves were brought to large towns from the interior and then exported to different and remote parts of India, as well as to the English and French colonies.

Indian public was at one with the Government of India and fully supported the abolition of slavery even without any compensation to the owners. So the evil traffic was gradually brought under control by a series of Regulations during half a century. The organized agitation against slave-trade in Britain, commencing in 1787, had its repercussion in India. In 1789 an official proclamation made it illegal to collect together persons for exporting them as slaves.[41] The slave trade was abolished by Britain in 1807, in the British Empire. In 1811 the importation of slaves into India from outside was forbidden. The purchase and sale of slaves brought from one district to another was made a criminal offence in 1832. Slavery was abolished in Britain in 1833, and twenty million pounds was voted by Parliament as compensation for the losses of the slave-owners. The Charter Act of 1833 required the Governor-General in Council to abolish slavery as soon as it could be safely and conveniently done. India Act V of 1843 made slavery illegal in India, but no compensation was paid to the owners. Lastly, keeping slaves or trafficking in them became an offence under the Indian Penal Code, enacted in 1860.[42]

VII. THE EMANCIPATION ACT

The Emancipation Act, which was always regarded by Lord Dalhousie as the most important of those passed by him, was contained in a single section, which ran as follows:

> "So much of any law or usage now in force within the territories subject to the Government of the East India Company as inflicts upon any person forfeiture of rights or property, or may be held in any way to impair or affect any right of inheritance, by reason of his or her renouncing, or having been excluded from, the communion of any religion, or being deprived of caste, shall cease to be enforced as law in the courts of the East India Company, and in the courts established by Royal Charter in the said territories."[43]

The main object as well as the effect of this Act was to remove a great difficulty in the way of those who wished to embrace Christianity. As the converts to Christianity were mostly recruited from the Hindus, the new legislation created great excitement among them. There were special reasons for this. Under the Hindu Law succession to a deceased's property involved the duty of performing certain religious rites for the salvation of the departed soul. As these had to be done according to the prescription of the Hindu *sastras,* a Hindu convert to another religion was neither willing nor qualified to perform them. The Hindus, therefore, very rightly contended that the new Act constituted a great infringement of their religious principles. There were less defensible grounds of objection, too. The missionary propaganda in India was not always kept within reasonable limits. It was openly alleged, even by men whose opinion carried weight, that conversion to Christianity was sometimes made by force or fraud, not unoften backed by the authority of the ruling power and the prestige attaching to a member of the ruling race. Whatever we may think of this, there is hardly any doubt that in most cases the converts were attracted more by material consideration than by the precepts of Jesus. Free maintenance, lure of good jobs, and many other similar considerations, not excluding payment in cash or kind, accounted for the largest number of converts to Christianity. This naturally alarmed the Hindu community. On the top of all this came the new legislation which threatened to take away the last obstacle in the way of such converts by removing the disqualification of inheriting ancestral property. This facilitated the conversion of precisely that class of persons which no society is prepared to lose.

It is, therefore, no wonder, that there was a violent agitation against the proposed legislation. Mass meetings were held and petitions were sent to the authorities in large numbers The failure of all the attempts to stop the proposed legislation not only caused righteous indignation against what was almost universally believed to be a serious infringement of Hindu religion, but gave an edge to the belief, then generally held, that the British Government really intended to convert the Indians to Christianity. The effect of this belief on the great outbreak of 1857 has been referred to above.[44] It cannot be gainsaid that of all the socio-religious measures of the British Government which are usually held responsible for that outbreak, the Emancipation Act is the only one which can, on reasonable grounds, be put in that category.

VIII. POST-MUTINY REFORMS

The outbreak of the Mutiny in 1857 had an adverse effect on the progress of social legislation. It was held in many quarters that the laws prohibiting *Sati* and permitting remarriage of widows were contributory causes to that great upheaval. Some colour is lent to it by the fact that proclamations issued by some rebel leaders referred to these as evidence of the deliberate intention of the British Government to convert the Hindus into Christianity. It is, however, Permissible to doubt whether these laws had any appreciable effect on the minds of the people at large, or whether the propaganda, based on them, did influence in any way the course of events during the great outbreak. It is to be noted that Bengal, where alone the *Sati* was a glaring evil, took no part in the revolt. The very recent legislation on the remarriage of widows in 1856 could hardly affect the people seriously in 1857, and it was only in Bombay and Bengal, two provinces that remained neutral, that this reform was a living issue. But whatever may be the truth, the years following the Mutiny were marked by an extreme unwillingness on the part of the British Government to interfere with socio-religious customs and usages of the country.

Reference may be made to the abolition of a cruel rite, known as "hook-swinging", a ceremony observed during the *Charak Pūjī* festival. On this occasion, a number of devotees "cast themselves on thorns and upraised knives; they pierce their arms or tongues by iron arrows, draw strings through the flesh of their sides, or fix thereto spikes that are heated by continually burning fire, while others swing on the Charak tree by hooks fastened through the muscles of their backs".[45] Men were tied to a rope attached to a wheel and rapidly whirled round, while in some cases, iron pikes or arrows were inserted into the back, legs or other parts of their bodies. Sometimes the rope snapped and the body was thrown at a distance of 25 to 30 yards, reduced to a shapeless mass. In all cases the men were all but dead when brought down from the wheel. These cruel practices drew public attention, but the Government did not like to interfere. The question came into prominence in 1856-57 when the Court of Directors took interest in the matter and the Calcutta Missionary Conference memorialised the Government for the suppression of the cruelties. After careful consideration Sir F. Halliday, Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal (1854-59), came to the conclusion that, as the case was one of pain voluntarily undergone, the remedy must be left to the missionary and the school-master, and that, as stated by the Court of Directors, all such cruel ceremonies must be discouraged by influence rather than by authority.

Sir J. P. Grant (1859-62), the successor of Halliday, instituted an inquiry from which it appeared that the hook-swinging was confined to Bengal proper and Orissa. Where this practice existed as a long established custom the local authorities were directed, by using their personal influence, and by obtaining the co-operation of the Zamindars, to induce the people voluntarily to abandon the practice. On the other hand, where *Charak* swinging was not an established custom but a mere occasional exhibition, the Magistrates were authorized to prohibit its celebration as a local measure of police for the preservation of order and decency.[46]

In 1864-65 the subject of hook-swinging at the *Charak Pūjā* came up again. After consulting the British Indian Association and obtaining from them a recommendation that all cruel practices should be suppressed, so long as no religious observances were interfered with, Sir Cecil Beadon issued a Resolution on the subject on 15 March, 1865. It directed all Magistrates of Districts in the Lower Provinces to prevent any person from the act of hook-swinging or other self-torture in public, and from the abetment thereof. Persons disobeying any such injunction were to be prosecuted and punished according to law. As a result of these orders the cruel rites in connection with the *Charak Pūjā* practically ceased, though the *Pūjā* continued with many popular amusements.[47]

Two important Acts were passed of which the first did not concern either the Hindus or the Muslims. This Act, passed in 1872, at the instance of the Brāhma Samāj, and applicable only to those who were outside the pale of Hinduism, Islām or other recognized faiths, abolished polygamy and marriage of girls before 14, and sanctioned inter-caste marriages and remarriages of widows.

It was not till more than thirty years after the Mutiny that the Government again undertook any important legislation affecting the social custom of the Hindus. Behramji Merwanji Malabari, a Parsi, had been agitating to secure legislation against child-marriage and placed his views before the public in his *Notes on Infant Marriage and Enforced Widowhood* in 1884. He was mainly instrumental in procuring the passing of an Act in 1891, known as the Age of Consent Act, forbidding the consummation of marriage before the wife had reached the age of twelve. It was a poor substitute for the prohibition of early marriage of girls, and, from the very nature of the case, its practical effect could not be of much consequence. Nevertheless, it roused a storm of protest, reminiscent of the orthodox Hindu opposition to the abolition of the *Sati*. A special significance was added to it by the fact that Bal Gangadhar Tilak, a highly educated and advanced thinker, and destined to become one of the greatest national leaders of India at no distant date, took the lead in the opposition, and first came into prominence in public life in this connection. Tilak made it quite clear that he objected, not to the provisions of the Bill, but to the right of a foreign Government to interfere in the social reform of the Hindus. How far his position is tenable, even in this limited view of the question, is a debatable point and cannot be discussed here. Tilak came in for a good deal of criticism and his political opponents made capital out of his attitude to this question. But, as already pointed out above, it was a question of fundamental policy which divided the social reformers in India long before Tilak. Those who blamed him hardly realized that he merely continued the traditions of Rammohan Roy, the pioneer of social reform, followed by many eminent Hindu leaders throughout the 19th century.[47a] Tilak seems to have also represented a characteristic phase of newly born Indian nationalism which was too proud of its past culture to admit the necessity of any social reform, save by the unfettered authority of the Indians themselves. The growing strength of this feeling did more to retard social legislation than even the apathy or reluctance of the British Government. It is not perhaps without significance that as nationalism advanced in India, the ardour for social reform visibly declined. As will be shown later, nationalism grew rapidly in Bengal in the last quarter of the 19th century, while Madras considerably lagged behind. A great social reformer writes: "By 1896, Madras had come to the forefront in social reform, and Bengal was passing through a reactionary phase. The resolutions adopted at the annual (Social) Conference at Calcutta were passed after strong opposition from the Bengal delegates...... The Bengal social reformers wanted to move in social reform along national and Aryan lines."[47b]

IX. EDUCATION OF WOMEN

Reference has been made in the preceding volumes to the high educational attainment of Indian women in the Vedic age and its gradual decline in subsequent ages. Things came to such a pass that at the beginning of the nineteenth century, a regular system of female education was practically unknown in most parts of India. The daughters of aristocratic families, particularly those who had to administer their estates, got a smattering of elementary education at home, and there were no doubt some exceptional individual cases here and there.[47c] But as a general rule, education of females was positively discouraged. It was regarded as being against the injunctions of the Hindu scriptures, and there was a wide-spread belief that the education of girls leads to their widowhood.

The first efforts towards female education were made by the Christian missionaries, almost immediately after the restrictions against missionary work in this country were removed by the Charter Act of 1813. Inspired by the zeal of spreading gospel among the natives they thought that it was first of all necessary to eradicate the superstitions and idolatry from the minds of the Hindu women. They openly taught Christianity in their schools and hoped that the girls "now engaged in the degrading and polluting worship of idols shall be brought to the knowledge of the true God." Referring to Hindu girls bearing names of Hindu gods and goddesses (Annapūrṇā, Vishṇupriyā etc.) it was remarked: "What kind of conduct ought we to expect from these poor children, named by their parents after imaginary goddesses, whose adultery, cruelty, and gratification of their passions, as detailed by their own sacred writings, are so abominable?"[48]

But whatever the motive, these Christian missionaries were the first to start schools for educating the girls. As girls of respectable families were not allowed to join these, their first pupils were recruited from the lowest classes of Indians who were "bribed to give an irregular attendance."[49] A correspondent in a Bengali paper, dated June 25, 1831, remarks that 'for the last twenty years the missionary *sahibs* established schools at great expenses to teach the *Bāgdi, Vyādh,* gipsy, *vairāgī* and prostitute girls. But they have not made any progress beyond the elementary instruction in reading and writing. It has not done any good, but is likely to do much evil'.[50]

The first missionary school in Bengal was founded by Mr. May at Chinsura. But the first organized effort towards female education in Bengal was made by the Calcutta Female Juvenile Society founded in 1819. It taught eighty students during the first year. At the end of six years it taught one hundred and sixty female pupils in six schools. We learn from the Thirteenth Report dated 1834 that it maintained three schools in Calcutta and its immediate neighbourhood in which about 200 girls were taught reading, spelling and geography by native women.

In 1821 the British and Foreign School Society of England, in consultation with the Calcutta School Society's agent Mr. Harrington and Mr. Ward of the Serampore Mission, both then in England, opened a subscription for a qualified lady teacher to be sent to India, and sent out Miss Cooke from England. As she was to work under the Calcutta School Society, a meeting of this Society was proposed to be convened to discuss the subject. But the Native Secretary of the Society, Radha-kanta Dev, wrote to the European Secretary that no such meeting was necessary, as "none of the good and respectable Hindu families will give her (Miss Cooke) access to their women's apartment, nor send their females to her school, if organised." He suggested that "Miss Cooke may render her services to the schools lately established by the Missionaries for the tuition of the poorer classes of native females."[51]

This letter, dated 10 December, 1821, confirms the poor state of female education as noted in Adam's Report, referred to above.

But it is mentioned in the letter that in some families private tutors teach the girls up to the age of 9 or 10 years, at the farthest. The reluctance of the high-class Hindus to send their girls to the missionary schools was probably due as much to old prejudices as to the attitude and openly avowed object of the missionaries, mentioned above. The low-class girls of the type noted above, who attended these schools, sometimes even attracted by cash rewards for daily attendance, also stood in the way of respectable girls joining them. The missionaries did not at first realize this aspect of the question. It appears from an article in the *Calcutta Review* that the wife of a missionary, after labouring for many years in these schools (outside Bengal), had discovered, what she had not had the slightest suspicion of before, that almost everyone of many hundreds of girls who had attended her schools belonged to the prostitute class.[52] These facts explain the slow progress of female education in this country. Adam's Report of 1838 also supplies statistics to show that the girls attending schools even in mofussil towns in Bengal mostly belonged to the lowest classes in society.

Nevertheless, the efforts of the missionaries bore fruit, and a great deal of credit for this belongs to Miss Cooke (later Mrs. Wilson). The number of schools was increased to 30 and that of the pupils to 600. The efficient supervision of so many schools proved to be a difficult task. So instead of multiplying such schools, it was decided to establish a Central School. Raja Baidya-nath Roy made a liberal donation of Rs. 20,000/- and the foundation-stone of the school building was laid on May 18, 1826, by Lady Amherst. On April 1, 1828, Mr. and Mrs. Wilson took charge of the Central School with 58 pupils, but the number rose to 320 in 1834. An interesting feature of the school was the payment of an allowance of one pice per student to the maid-servants called *Hurkarees* who collected them from different houses and brought them to school.

According to Adam's Report there were many other missionary schools for girls in Bengal in 1834, the total number probably exceeding 50. The girls in these schools were taught reading, spelling, writing, arithmetic, needle work, and, in some cases, religion.

These missionary schools could not attain success for several reasons. In the first place, too much attention was devoted to preaching of Christianity. As Rev. K. Banerji put it, "in those schools little had been done in an educational, though much attempted in the catechising, way." Secondly, there was lack of good teachers. Thirdly, as noted above, the girls attending the schools belonged to the lowest classes, and not unoften, even from the brothels. Even these were removed from schools in their ninth or tenth year.

The first thing necessary for the improvement of female education was to remove the prejudices against it from the minds of the upper classes. An attempt in this direction was made by Pandit Gaurmohan Vidyalankar, who wrote in 1822 a pamphlet entitled *Strīśikshā-vidhāyaka*. He quoted numerous examples and *Śāstric* texts to prove that female education was formerly prevalent among the higher classes of the Hindus, and that far from being injurious or disgraceful, it ought to be welcome as producing the most beneficial effect upon the intellectual and moral development of women and domestic peace and happiness.

In the third edition of the book, published by the School Book Society in 1824, the author added at the beginning a dialogue between two girls which throws an interesting light on the state of female education in those days. A few passages are reproduced below in free translation.

Q. Women have begun to read and write. How do you like this?

A. The thing begun by the *Shahibs* is for our good....

Q. But old men say that a girl who reads and writes becomes a widow.

A. This is nonsense. It is not supported by scriptures, and our Purāṇas refer to many educated women. Take, for example, the European ladies. They are educated but not widows.

Q. Out of the 800 girls reading in about fifty schools is there any one of good family?

A. No, girls of good family do not yet go to school, but read and write in secret.

Q. Let me see what you have written. I shall show it to your father-in-law.

A. What a shame! It is an infamy to show it to male members.

In the sequel it was arranged that the daughter-in-law would be taught by a woman of low class not only the three R's but also needlework, which the latter had learnt in a missionary school.

In spite of such vigorous support of female education, the spirit of hostility against it continued among a section of the public, though gradually people began to take a more reasonable view. This is evident from a number of correspondence on the subject published in Bengali newspapers between 1831 and 1838, containing arguments both against and in favour of it.[53] A brief reference may be made to it as throwing interesting light on the mentality of the people.

One writer argues that female education is unnecessary, for there are no Bengali books which can instil real knowledge. A course of elementary instruction is unnecessary for girls, for there are enough men to carry on the work of *Patwari, Muhuri, Nazir* etc. for which such instruction is a necessary qualification. To the argument that to keep women uneducated is to treat them like animals, it is replied that such is the eternal law of the Hindus. As regards the actual instances of the learned ladies such as Haṭī Vidyālaṅkār, Rāṇī Bhavānī and others of modern age, it is said that they did something repugnant to the *Śāstras.* If the Hindu girls attend schools like English ladies, they can as well marry many husbands. In conclusion it is said that girls who attend schools are likely to lose their virtuous character, and some remarks are made in this connection which are too vulgar to be repeated.

In reply it is argued that the plea of eternal Hindu Law is not supported by *Śāstric* texts, and is not only opposed to actual examples of learned ladies, but also to religious rites of old which require the wife to participate in it. It is pointed out that women in Mahārāshṭra are highly educated and openly perform Vedic religious rites in public. If Ahalyā Bāi or Rāṇī Bhavānī did wrong by educating themselves, our girls who go to school would be in good company. That to serve the husband is the chief duty of women is admitted; but there is nothing to show that education would stand in the way of properly performing this duty. As regards the fear of losing morals, it is pointed out that the schools were not meant for grown-up girls.

The most interesting part of the reply concerns the remarriage of English widows. It is said that for every general rule there are specific exceptions. For example, to drink wine or kill animals is forbidden to Brahmins but permissible on occasions of religious sacrifices. Similarly, the European law and custom sanctions the marriage of widows whereas Hindu scriptures forbid it. There is therefore no reason why Hindu girls should follow this practice.

A Brahmin writer points out that with the spread of higher education among the boys, female education has been all the more necessary, as otherwise the wives would not really be help-mates of their husbands and share their thoughts and feelings, and thereby the conjugal love and domestic happiness will both suffer. He therefore suggested that each important locality should establish schools for girls. As against this, it is pointed out by another that women are by nature deceitful, and their knowledge and learning will produce evil instead of good. He quoted the phrases *strībuddhiḥ pralayaṅkarī*,[4] and *viśvāso naiva kartavyaḥ strīshu rājakuleshu cha.*[55] The writer also shows the undesirability of the girls going on foot to schools and being taught by male teachers.

As a matter of fact, the Purdah system was a great obstacle to girls attending schools. It was therefore suggested that at first only low class women, who were used to move out freely in public, should attend schools, and after they were sufficiently educated, they would be engaged to teach the female members of respectable families. Even if one lady in every respectable family got education, she would be able to instruct the other members of that family. Rev. K. M. Banerji was of opinion, in 1840, that a good number of Hindus would gladly accept the services of well-qualified European ladies, if they could get them free of charge within their doors. He, therefore, suggested that an attempt should be made to procure a number of such ladies for the purpose of instructing the Hindu women in their own houses. The only difficulty he apprehended was on the score of expense. "But", he added, "considering how much the European community is indebted to this country, whence they are drawing so much of gold and silver, I have no hesitation in saying that they owe it to the natives, even upon moral considerations, to instruct and enlighten their sons and daughters."

It is doubtful, however, if such an experiment, even if it were really tried, would have been successful to any large extent. For many Hindus were averse to the idea of European tutoress as the pupils were likely to imbibe Christian principles.

In addition to the general prejudice, based on customs, Rev. Banerji adduced two other grounds to explain the slow progress of female education among the Hindus. The first was the absence of any pecuniary advantage resulting therefrom. "Their desire to teach male children is the consequence of the prospect which knowledge opens of wealth and honour, and since their girls cannot enter into any sphere of active labour in the world, they do not feel any incentive towards their education." The second reason advanced by him was that "as the female members of the family who received education would dislike the drudgery of household work, it would materially increase the expenses of the household." He thought that "the poor salaries of many Hindus teach them the policy of keeping their women down for fear of swelling their expense."

It is difficult to form an accurate idea of the extent to which these economic causes operated against female education. But so far as the upper classes were concerned, the two social causes, viz., fear of widowhood of an educated girl, and the strict observance of Purdah, stood mainly in the way of the growth of girls' schools.

An obvious way to avoid the difficulty of sending girls to public schools was for the educated male members of the family to undertake the duty of teaching the females. Indeed it may appear somewhat strange that young men educated in English schools and imbued with liberal ideas should not have themselves taught their young wives at home. But the real difficulty in the way of instruction at home, in most cases, was the inveterate prejudices of the elder ladies of the family against female education in any form. These mothers, grandmothers, aunts etc., who exercised unlimited sway over the internal management of the household, were seized with a superstitious terror of early widowhood of the educated girl, or some great calamity to the family into which female education was introduced. As a writer remarked in 1855, 'the Macedonian Phalanx did not stand more firmly man to man, than do they unite to frustrate any efforts that a young educated husband may make to instruct his wife.'

Prejudices die hard not only among women but also among men. For, in spite of liberal ideas of a section of the public, and arguments in favour of female education published in books, pamphlets, and newspapers, the majority of the Hindus in Bengal, particularly in Mofussil areas, were for a long time bitterly opposed to the idea not only of sending girls to schools but even of starting such institutions. The following account of a girls' school at Baraset, about 14 miles from Calcutta, throws into relief the great difficulties that pioneers of female education had to encounter even in the middle of the nineteenth century.

A female school was opened at Baraset in 1849 by three public-spirited gentlemen, two of whom were Government officials. "These, with some other liberal-minded and active young men belonging to the station, induced several of the more respectable residents in the town and neighbouring villages to send their girls to the new school. Shortly after its opening, the school was visited by Mr. Bethune, who presented it with maps, pictures, books, &c. At first it was held in a temporary building, but subsequently in a *pukka* house, built expressly for the purpose. The most violent animosity was exhibited on the part of the more bigoted portion of the community towards the school and every one connected with it. The law was, as usual, enlisted in the cause of oppression and persecution. Charges of assault, suit for arrears of rent, and complaints of all kinds and characters, were brought against the parents of those who sent their daughters to the school. Fortunately this bright idea of legal persecution occurred during the temporary magistracy of Mr. Hodgson Pratt, who was not satisfied with the mere reports of *darogas* and *nazirs,* but enquired himself into each charge, as it came before him. Otherwise, the result might have been most disastrous. The members of the female school committee were abused in the streets with the foulest language, and every kind of annoyance that vindictiveness could suggest, was brought to bear against them. One morning it was found that a broad and deep ditch had been dug in the night in front of the house of one of these gentlemen! Notwithstanding all this, and a great deal more than this, they persevered, and the poorest people persevered in sending their children to school, though they were excommunicated, and in every possible way annoyed and persecuted for doing so. At last they tired out the perseverance and ingenuity of their persecutors. All opposition has died away; but, as is too often the case, the excitement and the interest have died away with it; and although the school still exists, the numbers who attend it are smaller than in the days of its early struggles. Still the number is almost twenty, one or two of whom learn a little English; but they leave at a very early age. The falling off is mainly the result of the inevitable tendency of all good undertaken in this country to languish for want of support, when the excitement of novelty is worn off. Verily, this is the land where 'all good dies, death lives."[56].

The most important landmark in the history of women's higher education in Bengal was the foundation in May, 1849, of a school in Calcutta by J. E. D. Bethune, whose name will be for ever remembered as a great patron of female education. He was the President of the Council of Education and rightly concluded that female education could not flourish unless people of higher classes could be induced to send their girls to schools. He made stringent regulations to ensure this. No pupil was to be admitted without carefully examining the respectability of her family. The conveyance of the girls, to and from the institution, was arranged in a manner to which no exception could be taken. No male person was to be admitted within the walls of the institution while the girls were within it. Mr. Bethune voluntarily made a pledge, which no one ever suspected him of any intention to violate, that Christianity should be entirely excluded from the course of the institution. It was a great experiment, but was not a great success at the beginning. The number of pupils did not at first exceed sixty. The untimely death of Mr. Bethune (1851) was a great blow to its progress, particularly as he could not leave an endowment sufficient to meet its expense. Fortunately, Lady Dalhousie immediately undertook to defray the charges, and on her death the Governor-General agreed to continue the subscription (about Rs. 600 a month) as long as he would remain in India; and, on his recommendation, the Court of Directors engaged that, on his retirement, they would take the charge upon themselves.

Reference should be made in this connection to Pandit Ishwarchandra Vidyasagar who rendered yeoman's service to the cause of women's education in Bengal. He acted as the Honorary Secretary of the Bethune School, and when, after the retirement of Dalhousie, it became a Government institution, he was appointed, first, the Secretary, and then a member of the School Committee. But Vidyasagar's activity for the promotion of women's education was not confined to the Bethune School. He was instrumental in opening no less than thirty-five girls' schools in Bengal between November, 1857 and May, 1858.

In Bombay the women led a comparatively freer life as there was no purdah among the Marathas. Both in Bombay and Poona English-educated young men spread education through girls' schools since 1851. The students of the Elphinstone Institution in Bombay, encouraged by their English professors, established the Students Literary and Scientific Society which espoused the cause of women's education. The Parsi community of Bombay also felt the need of such education, and when F. C. Banajee showed the way by giving his daughter English education, others followed in his footsteps. As a result of his pioneer effort the Students' Literary and Scientific Society started morning classes for girls by their free voluntary service. This led to the establishment of seven more schools. A journal for women, *Strī-bodh,* was started in 1857.

Sir Charles Wood's Despatch of 1854 laid great stress on the importance of female education in India, and the subsequent progress of female education has been noted above.[57]

---

1. The views of Ranade that follow, including quotations, are taken from the *Religious and Social Reform—A Collection of Essays and Speeches by M. G. Ranade,* compiled by A. B. Kolaskar (Bombay, 1902), Introduction, and pp. 156-178.
2. C.Y. Chintamani, *Indian Social Reform,* II. 85-95. Many persons quote only this speech, but ignore the earlier views of Ranade, mentioned above.
3. Buckland, I. 324-5.
4. Kolaskar, op. cit, xxvi, xxviii, 92-114.
5. Banerji, B. N., II. 186-88. The letters are in Bengali.
6. Bankim-chandra argued at length, in several essays, against the total prohibition of polygamy, as it was likely to produce some evils.

6a. Warner, I. 296.
7. Buckland, I. 323.

7a. Natarajan, 50.

7b. Cf. p. 107.

7c. Natarajan, 61-2.
7d. Ibid, 56-7.
7e. Ibid, 84-5.
7f. Cf. p. 115.
7g. Cf. pp. 107 ff.
7h. For details, cf. Natarajan, Ch. VIII.
7i. Ibid, 102.
7j. Ibid, 107.
8. Dubois, Jean Antoine, *Hindu Manners, Customs and Ceremonies*, written early in the nineteenth century. Dubois spent about 30 years in India (1792-1823). He abjured European society, put on Indian dress, and lived amongst the Indians. He noted the customs from his own careful observation. Of course, we should make due allowance for natural errors of a foreigner and prejudices of a Christian missionary. For a list of abuses noted by Dubois, Cf. Kolaskar, Ranade, 179-97.
9. To which others may be added. Cf. Miles, *Land of the Lingam*, where reference is made to *chidi-mari* or hook-swinging in South India (p, 33) *taipusan*, or a pilgrimage under torture (p. 34), dancing girls in temples (p. 181), etc.
10. They must have been prevalent for years, probably for centuries.
11. Dancing girls in temples who were supposed to have dedicated their lives to gods; but in practice, many of them were no better than common whores.
12. Though the word *'sati'* is used to denote the ceremony, it literally means a good or chaste woman, i.e., the widow, who, by burning herself along with her dead husband's body, is supposed to prove her goodness or chastity.
13. See Vol. II (1960), 567; III (1962), 571-2.
14. See Vol. VI, p. 379, f. n., 30.
15. Griffiths, 222.
16. The facts mentioned in this section are stated with full references in the *Calcutta Review*, 1867, pp. 221-261, and K. Datta-I, Ch. III.
17. K. Datta-I, 75,77; statistical figures are given on pp. 79-82.
18. *CHI*, VI. 135-6.
19. Ibid.
20. It is difficult to form an accurate estimate of public opinion on the abolition of the *'sati'*. As against the prevalent view, stated in this para, one might cite the incident mentioned by Bishop Heber (I. 93), namely, that in a public meeting the proposal to thank Lord Hastings for supporting *'sati'* was defeated by a majority of votes.
21. K. Datta-II, 97-8.
22. *Rammohun*, p. 20.
23. *Works*, 323-72; K. Datta-. 100-107.
24. K. Datta-I, 107.
24a. Collet (1962), p. 199.
25. K. Datta-I, 108; Boulger, *Bentinck* (RI), p. 87. Bentinck also gathered the information that the abolition of the *Sati* would not affect the native army.
26. Collet, p. 258.
27. Cf. Bentinck's Minute of 8 November, 1829.
28. For the text of the Minute, cf. Keith, I. 208 ff. Boulger, *Bentinck*, 96 ff.
29. K. Datta-I, 112-3.
30. *CHI*, VI. 142.
31. For the text of the petition, written both in Bengali and English, cf. Collet, 461. For the text of both the petitions and the one by the Christian inhabitants of Calcutta, and Bentinck's reply to these, cf. *Selections from Calcutta Gazette* (1824 to 1832), ed. by A. C. Das Gupta, pp. 466-478. For other petitions, papers, meetings, etc., cf. ibid, pp. 308-10, 389, 427-9, 540-1, 563-7, 647-8. Also, B. N. Banerji, I. 280-94.
32. *Works*, 479-80.
32a. Judicial Criminal Proceedings, 29 November, 1816, No. 51. I am indebted for this information to Dr. R. M. Lahiri.
33. *Sketches*, III. 207.
34. *CHI*, VI. 129-30.
35. Ibid, 130-1; *Sketches*, III. 207.
36. See Vol. II, p. 565.
37. Ibid.
38. Cf. the two letters mentioned above, on p.
38a. Natarajan, 97.
39. See Vol. II, p. 576.

40. *CHI,* VI. 127-8.
40a. For these and other allegations cf. Amal Kumar Chattopadhyaya, *Slavery in India,* Chapter IV. But no authentic evidence is cited.
40b. B. N. Banerji, I, 185.
41. *The Bengal Journal* of 29 May, 1789, "refers to a mariner who took on board at Tullah one hundred and fifty unhappy children whom, previous to his departure, he had purchased in Bengal. The children were transported under British colours to Colombo where they were sold as slaves." Barns, 62.
42. *CHI,* VI 128.
43. Warner, I. 297.
44. See above, IX. 629.
45. Buckland, I. 32.
46. Ibid, 177.
47. Ibid, 312-4.
47a. See pp. 259-60, 273.
47b. Natarajan, 92.
47c. Some women like Haṭī Vidyālaṅkār in Bengal were renowned Sanskrit scholars.
48. *The Calcutta Journal,* 11 March, 1822.
49. *The Calcutta Review,* 1855, No. 25, p. 67.
50. B. N. Banerji, II. 68.
51. Cf. Introduction to *Strīśikshā-vidhāyaka* by Gaurmohan Vidyālaṅkār, p. 9 of the edition of 1344 B. S.
52. *The Calcutta Review,* 1855, p. 68.
53. B. N. Banerji, II. 67.
54. "Intelligence of women creates utmost disorder",
55. "One should not place any trust in women and kings."
56. *The Calcutta Review,* 1855, p. 79.
57. Cf. pp. 65-6.

CHAPTER VIII (XLVI).

MUSLIM COMMUNITY

1. MUSLIM POLITICS BEFORE THE ALIGARH MOVEMENT.

The reaction of the British conquest on the minds of the Muslims and the Hindus was bound to be very different. The Muslims naturally regarded the English as their bitterest foe who had usurped the political authority and the attendant privileges which they had so long enjoyed. Even as late as 1824-5, Bishop Heber observed that "the Muhammadans are hostile to the English as those who have supplanted them." The Hindus, on the other hand, not only welcomed the English rule, but even regarded it as a deliverance from the tyrannies and miseries of the Muslim rule, as mentioned above.[1] It is immaterial to discuss how far this Hindu attitude was justified by historical facts, but, right or wrong, its one inevitable result was to alienate the Hindus from the Muslims. But there were other causes at work widening the gulf which already existed between the two communities.[1a] The hostile attitude of the Muslims towards the English, and their strong aversion to merely secular education kept them severely aloof from English education imparted in schools and colleges. As noted above, the foundation of the Hindu College in 1817 gave a great impetus to the English education among the Hindus, but the Muslims made very little progress in it during the next fifty years. The comparative position of the Hindus and Muslims in English education will be evident from the following figures: In 1865, 9 Hindus and not a single Muhammadan passed the M.A. Examination; 41 Hindus and 1 Muhammadan passed the B.A.; and 17 students, all Hindus, passed the Law Examination. All the Medical graduates were also Hindus. In 1867, 88 Hindus and not a single Muhammadan passed the M.A. and B.A. Examinations.[2] During the period between 1858 and 1878 only 57 Muslims received Degrees (graduate and post-graduate) as against 3,155 Hindus.[3]

A very frank and lucid exposition of the relation between the Hindus and Musalmans, as conceived by the latter, was given by a liberal Muslim leader, R. M. Sayani, in his Presidential Address at the twelfth Indian National Congress, held in Calcutta in 1896. The following extract is a very candid expression of the sentiments which powerfully influenced the Muslim community as a whole throughout the nineteenth century:

"Before the advent of the British in India, the Musalmans were the rulers of the country. The Musalmans had, therefore, all the advantages appertaining to the ruling class. The sovereigns and the chiefs were their co-religionists, and so were the great landlords and the great officials. The court language was their own. Every place of trust and responsibility, or carrying influence and high emoluments, was by birthright theirs. The Hindus did occupy some position but the Hindu holders of position were but the tenants-at-will of the Musalmans. The Musalmans had complete access to the sovereigns and to the chiefs. They could, and did, often eat at the same table with them. They could also, and often did, intermarry. The Hindus stood in awe of them. Enjoyment and influence and all the good things of the world were theirs....By a stroke of misfortune, the Musalmans had to abdicate their position and descend to the level of their Hindu fellow-countrymen. The Hindus who had before stood in awe of their Musalman masters were thus raised a step by the fall of their said masters, and with their former awe dropped their courtesy also. The Musalmans, who are a very sensitive race, naturally resented the treatment and would have nothing to do either with their rulers or with their fellow-subjects. Meanwhile the noble policy of the new rulers of the country introduced English education into the country. The learning of an entirely unknown and foreign language, of course, required hard application and industry. The Hindus were accustomed to this, as even under the Musalman rule, they had practically to master a foreign tongue, and so easily took to the new education. But the Musalmans had not yet become accustomed to this sort of thing, and were, moreover, not then in a mood to learn, much less to learn anything that required hard work and application, especially as they had to work harder than their former subjects, the Hindus. Moreover, they resented competing with the Hindus, whom they had till recently regarded as their inferiors. The result was that so far as education was concerned, the Musalmans who were once superior to the Hindus now actually became their inferiors. Of course, they grumbled and groaned, but the irony of fate was inexorable. The stern realities of life were stranger than fiction The Musalmans were gradually ousted from their lands, their offices; in fact everything was lost save their honour. The Hindus, from a subservient state, came into the lands, offices and other worldly advantages of their former masters. Their exultation knew no bounds, and they trod upon the heels of their former masters. The Musalmans would have nothing to do with anything in which they might have to come into contact with the Hindus. They were soon reduced to a state of utter poverty. Ignorance and apathy seized hold of them while the fall of their former greatness rankled in their hearts."

Though, as noted above, the social relations between the Hindus and the Muslims underwent no radical change at the beginning of the nineteenth century, the political outlook of the two communities was very different from the beginning. English education was the mainspring of all political evolutions of the Hindus; it is therefore hardly a matter of surprise that the Muslims, who lagged so far behind the Hindus in this respect, would fail to keep pace with them. The other circumstances mentioned above also powerfully operated in the same direction, with the result that the two great communities, though subject to the same foreign rule, suffering from the same disabilities, and seeking the same remedies or reforms, could not present a united front in politics and meet on a common political platform.

This difference of approach in politics was clearly manifested, for the first time, in the Wahabi movement, an account of which has been given in Vol. IX (883-901). Although the later phase of the movement, namely, a violent hatred against the English and an organized attempt to drive them out, should have evoked sympathy at least among a section of the Hindus, there is no evidence that such was the case. The reason is that it was a purely Muslim movement and was directed theoretically against all non-Muslims—its aim being to establish in India a *dar-ul-Islam*, "Muslim sovereignty pure and simple". Actually the Wahabis first declared war against the Sikhs, and later merely transferred their hostility to the English when they conquered the Panjāb. It is true that, generally speaking, no definitely anti-Hindu spirit marked the movement as a whole.[4] But still the fact remains that all their proclamations were issued in the name and interest of Islam, and their appeals were only to the Muslims. The sympathy and support of the Hindus were never asked for; and it could hardly be done without violating the basic doctrine of the movement which sought to eradicate from India all power and influence other than Islam.

The political exclusiveness of the two communities was more convincingly demonstrated by the fact that the Muslims did not take any active part in the different political organizations to be referred to in Chapter XII. There was hardly any Muslim on the Committees of Landholders' Society, Bengal British India Society, and the British Indian Association. On the other hand, as soon as the Muslims became politically conscious, they started separate organizations of their own. A Muhammadan Association was started in Calcutta before

31st January, 1856. It is noteworthy that the Hindus regarded this separatist tendency as quite natural in view of the position of the Muslim community as a separate unit, and the Committee of the British Indian Association expressed rejoicings at the formation of this communal organization.[5] In 1863 Abdul Latif founded the Mohammedan Literary Society in Calcutta, its object being to interest its members in present day politics and modern thought and learning.[6] When the Hindu Melā and the National Society were started by the Hindus on communal basis, the Muslim leader, Nawab Amir Ali Khan, organized the National Mohammadan Association in Calcutta in 1877 with the object of 'promoting the well-being' and bringing about 'the political regeneration of the Indian Muslims'.[7]

Gradually the Muslim leaders appreciated the value of English education. In a public meeting held on January 10, 1868, Abdul Latif made a vigorous plea for the English education of Muhammadan boys and suggested the transformation of the Anglo-Persian Department of the Calcutta Madrasa to the status of a College.[8] The Muslim leaders in Bengal thus took a lead in this matter even before Sir Syed Ahmad thought of the Aligarh College. Although the proposal of Abdul Latif was not carried into effect, Muslim education in Bengal got a great impetus from the munificent charity of Hāji Muhammad Mohsin in 1873. He left a large legacy, and it was resolved by the Government that out of the Mohsin Trust Fund, two-thirds of the fees would be paid to every Muhammadan student in any English school or college in Bengal. This partly accounts for the greater progress of Muslim students of Bengal in English education as compared with other provinces. This is indicated by the following figures:

"In 1881-82 the number of Musalman students pursuing their studies in colleges in the Bengal Presidency was 106 as against 30 in Madras, 7 in Bombay, 29 in the N. W. Provinces, 7 in Oudh and 13 in the Punjab. In the High Schools of Bengal there were 3,831 Mussalman students, as against 177 in Madras, 118 in Bombay, 697 (including students in Middle Schools) in the N.W. Provinces, and 91 in the Punjab. Between 1858 and 1893 the Calcutta University produced 290 Mohammedan graduates, as against 29 of the Madras, 30 of the Bombay, 102 of the Punjab and 102 of the Allahabad University."[9]

Although the progress in English education advanced the political ideas of Muslims in Bengal, there was still a wide gap between the progressive elements of the two communities. The Muslim leaders lagged far behind the advanced political thinkers among the Hindus, and the Muslim politics always resembled more or less that of the Hindus nearly half a century before.

A very good glimpse of the Muslims and their politics in the eighties may be obtained from the writings of W. S. Blunt. He was a liberal-minded Englishman who openly protested against the British policy in Egypt and made a common cause with the Egyptian Mahdi in his fight against the English. His two books, *Secret History of the English* and *The Future of Islam* endeared him to the whole Muslim world, and he found a warm welcome awaiting him in India, when he visited this country in 1883. He mixed freely and intimately with the Muslim leaders of all shades of opinion, and his observations on Muslim politics should, therefore, command both respect and confidence.

From the very moment of his landing on Indian soil, Blunt received complaints about Hindus from the Muslims. As soon as he got down at Tuticorin, the local Muslims, who went to the pier to receive him, "complained of being subject to annoyance from the Hindus, who came with drums outside their mosque, and that the magistrate, being a Hindu, would not prevent it."[10]

In Calcutta Maulvi Sayid Amir Hussain, Deputy Magistrate and a friend of Amir Ali, told him that "the Bengali Mohammedans... were an oppressed community, the Hindus having it all their own way, and there was very little courage among them, though the antiquated Mohammedans and Hindus lived on excellent terms. They dared not take any prominent part against the Government."[11] The position is further elucidated by the following extract:

"Delawar Huseyn, a deputy-magistrate and a sensible man, gave the same melancholy account of the poverty of the Mohammedans in Bengal. I fear their case is nearly hopeless. In spite of their large population, they are without influence. The mass of them are extremely poor, mere peasants, or, in the town, day labourers. They have no commercial connection, and the sons of the few rich men are obliged to look to Government employment for a living, whereas the Hindus are rich and pushing. It is a struggle for existence, in which the Mohammedans are the weakest, and so are going to the wall. In the north-west, he tells me, it is not so."[12]

At that time the great agitation over the Ilbert Bill was going on, and Lord Ripon's Government practically conceded the Anglo-Indian demands by offering a compromise or "concordat" which was strongly opposed by the Hindus. Maulvi Samiulla of Aligarh told Blunt "that the proper conduct for the Mohammedans here was being debated, some being for expressing themselves satisfied, others for making common cause with the Hindus....He had seen Amir Ali yesterday, who had changed his mind and was now on the Government side. He wants, the Maulvi[12a] explained naively, to get promotion, and that is why he supports the compromise. He himself was for a moderate attitude."[13] Blunt's reply to this Muslim gentleman and his companions is characteristic of him and may be quoted in full.

"I spoke my mind very plainly, and told them that, if they deserted the Hindus in this instance, they would never have any reform given or justice done them for another twenty years. They must sink their differences and their little private interests if they wanted to force the Government's hand. The Bill was the battleground on which the whole principle of legislation for India was being fought; and the Mohammedans could turn the scale by their attitude one way or the other. The young men warmly applauded this, and I think, too, the Maulvi was partly convinced. I told them, if the Mohammedans only knew their power they would not be neglected and ill-treated by the Government as they now were. In England we were perpetually scared at the idea of a Mohammedan rising in India, and any word uttered by a Mohammedan was paid more attention to than that of twenty Hindus. But, if they sat still, thanking Providence for the favours which were denied them, the English public would be only too happy to leave them as they were. The Maulvi promised to make my opinion known at a Conference which had been summoned for this evening to consider the action of the Mohammedans, and so I trust I may have done some good, at least with the liberal party. Of Abd-el-Latif I feel more doubtful. for there is great ill-feeling in Calcutta between the old-fashioned Mohammedans and the Hindus."[14]

Two days later, Blunt had a talk with Maulvi A.M. "He said that none of the Mohammedans wished to do away altogether with English Government, as it would only lead to fighting, as there was no chance of Mohammedans and Hindus agreeing for a century to come, but of course they did not like English administration. It favoured the Hindus unduly. But, left to themselves, they should be able to hold their own in all Northen India. The English policy, however, had been to suppress them, and throw obstacles in the way of their educating themselves and learning their own power. The Maulvis of Calcutta were terribly ignorant of politics, and of all that was going on in the world. At the time of the Egyptian War they had not known whether Egypt lay North or South or East or West. ...Then Abd-el-Latif's son, in European clothes, joined us, and we got on the Ilbert Bill, as to which I exhorted them all strongly to make a concordat with the Hindus, helping them this time on a promise of help from them when their own interests were at stake...

I had it out, however, with Abd-el-Rahman, and hope he will influence his father. Unless the Mohammedans show their teeth on an occasion of this sort, they will never get attention paid to their wrongs."[15]

Blunt's diary continues:—

"Next came Surendranath Bannerji. He is very angry at the Ilbert Bill compromise, and let slip the *gros mot* of 'revolution' in regard to it. He was very urgent with me to get the Mohammedans to join them in protesting, and I promised to do my best this evening at Amir Ali's dinner. It is high time certainly they should sink differences, but the Mohammedans are hard to move. Their position was well explained a little later by our last visitor this morning, Maulvi Ahmed, Municipal Councillor, and an independent man. He explained that there was hardly a leading man among the Calcutta Mohammedans who had any means apart from his Government pay. Neither Amir Ali nor Abd-el-Latif could afford to come forward as a champion, as all their prospects depended on the Government. Maulvi Ahmed drew a most gloomy picture of Mohammedan prospects. They were all, he said, in despair here in Bengal. It was impossible for them to do anything, impossible to combine with the Hindus who were so selfish, they wanted every post for themselves. Out of forty-eight Municipal Councillors there were only five Mohammedans, and as more power was given to the natives the Mohammedan position would get worse and worse. It was their poverty which stood in their way. They could not pay for the education necessary to pass the competitive examinations, so they were left behind. I tried to convert him to my view of energetic action, but in vain. There was no one to take the lead, and it would result in no good......[16]

"I had an opportunity of saying a few words to Abd-el-Latif about the attitude Mohammedans should take in this Ilbert quarrel, and he agreed with me that it might be well if they showed their teeth a little. But he is a cautious man and would promise nothing. With Amir Ali and Amir Huseyn I was able to do more, and I shall be surprised if, at the meeting of the National Mohammedan Society tomorrow, they do not take my view. I proposed that they should address a dignified and moderate protest to the Viceroy, admitting that the Ilbert Bill did not immediately affect the Mohammedan community, but taking their stand on the principle that the proposed compromise affected the rule of equality before the law. At the same time I advised Amir Ali to come to a regular concordat with the Hindus for their mutual benefit."[17]

Nevertheless, Amir Ali supported the Government view in the meeting of the Muslims (probably held under the auspices of the National Mohammadan Association). Blunt mournfully remarks: "His attitude with regard to the Ilbert compromise is not that of a leader."[18]

The difference between the two communities became accentuated in connection with the legislation for local self-government on elective basis. It is on this occasion that for the first time a demand was made for separate representation of the Muhammadans. It seems, however, that, as in later days, the ball was set rolling by the English officials. The Commissioner of the Presidency Division observed in his Report "that the agitators in this matter are Hindus, and that Local Boards, instituted as proposed, will be comprised almost entirely of Hindus to the exclusion of Mohammedans." Quoting this with approval, Muhammad Yusuf spoke as follows in the Legislative Council on May 3, 1883:

"The Council will be pleased to remember that though in most places the Mohammedan population forms a minority as compared with the larger bodies of the Hindus, still in many places they form a large proportion of the population. Or it may be that in some places, though fewer, the case is the reverse, and the Hindus form a minority. In such cases when there is party spirit and angry feeling between the two classes of people, it is necessary to reserve power for the representation of the minority. The Bill proposes to provide for this by nomination, but it would be an advantage and more fit recognition of the claims of the Mohammedan population if provision could be made in the Bill for the election of Mohammedans by reserving a certain number of membership for that community."[19]

The keynote of this speech is a firm conviction that even in political matters there is no common bond between the two communities and each must be ready to safeguard its own interests. Even more than thirty years before this, some English officials emphasised the communal difference in political matters in connection with the creation of Legislative Councils. Representative assembly in India was regarded as difficult in view of the difference between the Hindus and the Muslims, and in 1852 Lord Ellenborough even suggested the creation of two separate legislatures for the two communities. In those early days a vigorous protest against this was made by a Hindu politician, and no Muslims are known to have come forward to support the British or official view.[20] But Yusuf's speech shows the change that had come over the Muslim community.

This change was not confined to Bengal. It appears from Blunt's diary that the attitude of the Bengali Musalmans was shared by those in other parts of India. Four Muslim gentlemen, whom Blunt met at Delhi, agreed "that there should be more common action with the Hindus. But one of them was of opinion that the Hindus were impracticable, because they would not permit the killing of cows."[21] Nawab Alauddin Ahmad Khan, Chief of Loharo, told Blunt that "what he did not like about the mutineers was that most of them were Hindus."[22]

Reference should also be made in this connection to the Indian visit of Jamal-ud-din Al-afghani (1839-97), a notable figure in the Muslim world in the nineteenth century. He agitated for the liberation of Muslims from European influence and exploitation, for the union of all Islamic States under a single Caliphate, and the creation of a powerful Muslim Empire capable of resisting European intervention. There was a general impression at the time, particularly among the Hindu political leaders, that he was largely responsible for creating a split between the Hindus and the Muslims. Thus B. C. Pal observes: "It was about 1880 or 1881 that Djemal ed Din, the founder of the Pan-Islamic movement, came from Afghanistan to India, and had confidential conversations with the leaders of the Mahomedan community in this country. He came to Calcutta and met the late Nawab Abdul Latif and the small group of educated Mahomedans associated with him, including the late Justice Ameer Ali, and inoculated them with the virus of his Pan-Islamism. Before Djemal ed Din's advent the educated Indian Mohamedans, particularly in Bengal, had been loyally co-operating with their Hindu fellow-subjects for the common advancement of national political interests. But after his visit they commenced to draw themselves away from the political activities of their Hindu fellow-subjects until gradually a wide gulf was created between the Hindu and the Moslem intellectuals in the country in regard to our national endeavours."[23]

It is difficult to accept fully the above views. There is no doubt that Jamal-ud-din had come into contact with the Muslim leaders and that his views had great influence upon them. For this appears quite clearly from the writings of Blunt. Unfortunately, Blunt nowhere clearly says what those views were. But it appears from his book that they were widely different from those of Syed Ahmad, and were not incompatible with co-operation between the two communities. As will be clear from the extracts quoted above, Blunt never ceased to impress upon the Muslim leaders the value and necessity of such co-operation. His repeated insistence shows that such co-operation was lacking, and Blunt could not possibly have referred to Jamal-ud-din's views with respect and approval if he had reasons to believe that this Muslim leader was really instrumental in creating communal difference. It is, of course, quite possible that Blunt did not fully grasp the significance of Jamal-ud-din's teachings, specially their effect upon Indian Muslims.

But whether it was due to the teachings of Jamal-ud-din or not, indications are not wanting that the pan-Islamic sentiment had already been exerting influence upon Muslim minds. Some Muslim leaders told Blunt: "During the Egyptian War (1881-82) we all looked to Arabi (Pasha) to restore our fortunes, for we are in a desperate state and need a deliverer."[24] These words are significant. The Indian Muslims had already begun, or never ceased, to feel that the Muslims outside India were more closely allied to them than their neighbours, the Hindus. Such a feeling cut at the very root of the idea of Indian nationality. For howsoever people might differ in their views regarding the essentials of nationality, one thing is certain: No people can form a nation unless they are united by common sympathies such as do *not* exist between any constituent part of them and an outside element, and which make them co-operate with each other more willingly than with other people.

The influence of pan-Islamic feeling may also be traced in the evidence given by the Muslim leaders before the Hunter Commission, demanding entirely separate arrangements for the primary education of the Hindu and Muslim and insisting upon Urdu as a medium of instruction even in a province like Bengal where 99 per cent of the Muslims were ignorant of that language,[25] and their spoken language, Bengali, had always been the medium of instruction.[26]

According to Aga Khan, the average Indian Muslim looked upon himself as a member of a universal religious brotherhood, sojourning in a land in which a neutral government, with a neutral outlook, kept law and order and justice.[26a]

The British Government seem to have been fully aware of the influence of Pan-Islamism on Indian Muslims. Lord Hamilton, the Secretary of State, wrote to the Viceroy, Lord Elgin, on 30 July, 1897: "....We have, however, a new element of intrigue and commotion introduced into India by the Pan-Islamic Council in Constantinople and the close connection which is being established between the Sultan and Indian Mahomedans."[26b]

It is, however, difficult to agree with B. C. Pal that Jamal-ud-din was mainly responsible for the Muslim aloofness from the Hindus. For there is no evidence to show that before Jamal-ud-din's visit to India the educated Muslims of Bengal loyally co-operated with the Hindus in political matters. What has been stated above rather points out the other way. B. C. Pal's statement about the aloofness of the Muslims, based on his own experience, may be accepted as correct. But his view about the state of things before his time, and his diagnosis of the causes for the cleavage between the two, cannot command the same respect and confidence.

So far as evidence goes, Muslim politics, throughout the nineteenth century, has followed a course different from that of the Hindus. While the Hindus were developing their political ideas and political organizations on modern lines under the influence of English education, the Muslims launched the Wahabi movement, which was most violent and anti-British, and extremely communal in character. How far the outbreak of 1857 was the result of a co-operative movement between the two communities has been discussed above. Then came the Aligarh movement, also conceived in a communal spirit. It brought about the political and social regeneration of the Muslims, but at the same time widened the political cleavage between the Hindus and Muslims, and created a distinct Muslim unit in Indian politics.

II. THE ALIGARH MOVEMENT

Sir Syed Ahmad, whose views and activities gave rise to the Aligarh Movement, was born in A.D. 1817, and began his career as an official of the British Government at the age of about twenty. He held the office of the Sadar Amin at Bijnor when the Mutiny broke out, and remained loyal to the British throughout the great crisis. He saved the local Europeans by successful diplomacy, first with the mutineers, and then with Nawab Mahmud Khan, as mentioned above.[27] His loyal services were recognized by the grateful British Government and Syed Ahmad occupied a distinguished position after the Mutiny was over. But he utilised the opportunity, thus offered, not for advancing his own material interests, but for the uplift of his co-religionists. He pondered deeply over the deplorable situation of the Muslim community and made a noble resolve to take up its cause. He traced the sad plight of the Muslims to their innate conservatism which made them averse to English education and Western culture. Their position, bad in itself, was rendered worse by the Mutiny. There was a general impression among the British that the Muslims were the chief instigators and ringleaders of that great outbreak. The consequence was that the hands of repression fell more heavily upon the Muslims than upon the Hindus, and the Government came to entertain a permanent distrust of Muslim loyalty and allegiance to the British. The Muslims lost whatever little political influence they possessed, and their future prospect was indeed very gloomy.

Syed Ahmad set before himself the twofold task of bringing about a *rapprochement* between the British Government and the Muslims, and introducing the modern type of education among the latter. For the first object he exerted his utmost to wean away the Muslims from the fruitless, vindictive and sentimental opposition to the British. He gradually convinced them that their future interests from all points of view depended entirely on the favours of the Government, and these can be secured in full measure by loyal co-operation with the British. On the other hand, he persuaded the Englishmen to believe that the Muslims were not at heart disloyal to the British Crown, that there was nothing in the religious tenets of Islam which, as the Wahabis thought, rendered it obligatory upon the Muslims to take to *jihād*, i.e. declare a war of independence against the British; and lastly, that though the Muslims might have been carried away by emotion and erred in 1857 by leading the war against the British, it was merely a passing phase, and a little tact and generous forgiveness on the part of the Government could easily change the Muslims into a body of staunch supporters of the Government.

The appeal of Syed Ahmad to the British Government to take kindly to his community came at a very opportune moment. The British, like all imperial powers, instinctively followed the policy of *divide and rule* in governing India. They could not be possibly unaware of the fact that while the Muslims resented the establishment of British political authority, the Hindus welcomed it, and so at the beginning they unduly favoured the Hindus. But after two generations of the Hindus had imbibed Western ideas through English education, they showed signs of political development which was regarded by the Government as anti-British and almost revolutionary. So they eagerly seized the opportunity, offered by Syed Ahmad, of enlisting the support of the great but politically undeveloped Muslim community, and holding it as a counterpoise to the progressive Hindu community. Henceforth the British Government steadily followed the policy of clogging or putting a brake on one wheel of the car of India's political evolution, so that its progress may be slowed down, even if not altogether stopped.

A fair idea of the nature and extent of the distinct change that came over the British attitude towards the Muslims is given by Hunter's book, *The Indian Musalmans*, published in 1871. Hunter held that for many years the entire Muslim community had been disloyal and "a source of chronic danger to the British power in India".[28] But his whole book is a vigorous plea for 'rallying the Muslims' round the British Government by removing their genuine grievances.

Syed Ahmad did not confine his attention to the improvement of the relations between the Government and his co-religionists, but also devoted his heart and soul to a regeneration of his community. He raised his voice against Muslim orthodoxy in order to prove that there is nothing in the Qur'ān which stands in the way of the Muslims taking to English education and imbibing rational and advanced ideas as well as scientific knowledge of the West. In short, he urged the Muslims to follow the same line of development which was chalked out by Raja Rammohan Roy almost exactly half a century before. Both shared the same fate. Like Rammohan, Syed Ahmad met with violent opposition from the orthodox section; he was excommunicated and even threatened with assassination. But truth and courage triumphed in both cases. Syed Ahmad had the great gratification to see his endeavour crowned with success, probably beyond his wildest imagination. It may be said without exaggeration that no single man did so much for his community during the nineteenth century, as Rammohan and Syed Ahmad did, respectively, for the Hindus and the Muslims. But the effective good which India could derive from the progress of the two communities suffered a great deal by the time-lag of half a century between the two.

Syed Ahmad rightly regarded the Western knowledge through English education as the foundation of all real progress. The idea was not an original one, as noted above, but his credit lies in the practical steps he took to give effect to it. As early as 1864 he established an English school at Ghazipur. Next year he founded the "Scientific Society" for translating useful English books on various subjects into Urdu and circulating them among the Muslims. The Society also published a bilingual journal for spreading liberal ideas on social reform. In 1869 Syed Ahmad visited England and received a cordial welcome, being even received in audience by Queen Victoria. He had ample opportunity of studying at first hand the social and educational institutions of the English people, and felt more and more convinced that it is only by the assimilation of Western thought and culture that the Muslims could hope to recover anything like their former position in India. After his return in 1870, he made a more vigorous propaganda for the spread of English education and Western culture among his people. It is possible that the Young Turk Movement also inspired him and facilitated his work.

While Syed Ahmad is entitled to great credit for his laudable endeavour to uplift his community, it is somewhat painful to note that it had as its background a supreme contempt for the Indians. In a letter from London, dated 15th October, 1869, he writes: "Without flattering the English, I can truly say that the natives of India, high and low, merchants and petty shop-keepers, educated and illiterate, when contrasted with the English in education, manners, and uprightness, are as like them as a dirty animal is to an able and handsome man. Do you look upon an animal as a thing to be honoured? Do you think it necessary to treat an animal courteously, or the reverse? You do not! We have no right to courteous treatment. The English have reason for believing us in India to be imbecile brutes."[29]

Syed Ahmad was intoxicated with the wine of Western culture very much in the same way as the first generation of English-educated Hindus. But he went beyond all proportions and even exceeded the limits of decency. It is to be further remembered that at the time he wrote the letter he was not a young man fresh from an English institution, but a man of 52, with varied experiences in life. It is possible that his views underwent some change in course of time, but in any case the letter is a revealing one, and shows the wide gulf that separated the Hindus and Muslims at every stage of their national development. No Hindu, expressing such views in 1869, would have the least chance of being acclaimed as the leader of a movement for national regeneration.

While in England, Syed Ahmad conceived the idea of establishing an educational institution for Muslims in India on the lines of Oxford and Cambridge. The result was the Muhammadan Anglo-Oriental College at Aligarh, the foundation stone of which was laid by Lord Lytton on January 8, 1877. The Muslim community derived from it as much, if not more, impetus to progress on modern lines, as the Hindu community did from the Hindu College founded sixty years before. The College provided for liberal education in arts and sciences through the medium of English language, under a succession of able principals, recruited from England. It was a residential institution and helped a great deal in developing the mental outlook and personality of the young Muslim students on progressive lines. Syed Ahmad also started the Muhammadan Educational Conference as a general forum for spreading liberal ideas among the members of his community. He gathered round him a band of faithful followers who spread his ideas with conspicuous success. He thus inaugurated a new era in the life of Indian Muslims and infused fresh blood into the Muslim community at one of its greatest crises in life.

The Aligarh Movement, thus inaugurated by Syed Ahmad, is no less remarkable for the political evolution of the Muslims. In the ultimate form which it took, it grew definitely anti-Congress and anti-Hindu, but this characteristic was not distinctly perceptible at its inception.

It is not easy to form a clear idea of Syed Ahmad's attitude towards the Hindus and their advanced political ideals. Some of his early utterances are completely free from any communal bias. In a speech delivered in 1884 he said: "Do you not inhabit the same land? .... Remember that the words Hindu and Mahomedan are only meant for religious distinction—otherwise all persons, whether Hindu or Mahomedan, even the Christians who reside in this country, are all in this particular respect belonging to one and the same nation."[30] These words were received with loud cheers. In several other speeches also he referred to the Hindus and Muslims as forming one nation. To a Panjābi Hindu audience he said that every inhabitant of Hindusthan is a Hindu, and added, "I am therefore sorry that you do not regard me as a Hindu".[31] He bestowed high praise on the Bengalis. "They are", he said, "'the only people in our country whom we can properly be proud of, and it is only due to them that knowledge, liberty and patriotism have progressed in our country. I can truly say that really they are the head and crown of all the different communities of Hindusthan."[32] He also organized and presided over a meeting in 1877 in which Surendra-nath Banerji delivered a speech in favour of the simultaneous examinations for civil service in England and India, and a resolution in favour of it was unanimously passed.[33]

But some of Syed Ahmad's utterances, even of an earlier period, betray a mentality of just the reverse type. As far back as 1858 he deplored the fact (and regarded it as a cause of the Mutiny) that the two antagonistic races, Hindus and Muslims, were put into the same regiment of the British army, and thus a feeling of friendship and brotherhood sprang up between them. He significantly added: "If separate regiments of Hindus and separate regiments of Muhammadans had been raised, this feeling of brotherhood could not have arisen".[34] As will be noted later, the British took the lesson to heart and carried into practice the suggestion hinted by Syed Ahmad.

Again, in a speech at Mirat on 16 March, 1888, he refers to the Hindus and Muslims not only as two nations, but as two warring nations who could not lead a common political life if ever the British left India. Here are the exact words, conveying an idea so diametrically opposed to that to which he gave expression in other speeches four years earlier, as noted above: "Now suppose that all the English were to leave India, then who would be rulers of India? Is it possible that under these circumstances two nations, the Muhammadan and the Hindu, could sit on the same throne and remain equal in power? Most certainly not. It is necessary that one of them should conquer the other and thrust it down. To hope that both could remain equal is to desire the impossible and the inconceivable."[35]

Further, as early as 1883, he delivered a long speech deprecating the system of representative institutions, even for local self-government, and particularly the principle of election, pure and simple, in constituting Local Boards and District Boards, for fear that "the larger community would totally override the interest of the smaller community."[36] In this speech Syed Ahmad harped upon the elements of discord and disunion that divided India. "In one and the same district", said he, "the population may consist of various creeds and various nationalities". The whole speech is an eloquent plea against the conception of Indian nationality, and indicates the wide chasm that divided the Hindu and Muslim leaders in their political thoughts and ideas. For, it should be remembered that the speech was delivered in the same year when the Indian Association of Calcutta had summoned the National Conference, the first All-India political organization, and only two years before the Indian National Congress held its first session. This speech, however, did not stand alone. As a matter of fact, Syed Ahmad and his followers, in their speeches and writings, were never tired of emphasising that India was inhabited by different nations with different social, political, religious and historical traditions. All these ideas were brought to a head in a violent opposition to the Indian National Congress since its very inception. Syed Ahmad looked upon the system of representative government demanded by the Congress as dangerous to the interests of Muslims. He even broadly hinted that if the demand were conceded the Muslim minority might be forced to take up sword to prevent the tyranny of the majority. The following lines clearly indicate his trend of thought which also permeates his other speeches and writings:

"In a country like India where homogeneity does not exist in any one of these fields (nationality, religion, ways of living, customs, mores, culture, and historical traditions), the introduction of representative government cannot produce any beneficial results; it can only result in interfering with the peace and prosperity of the land. .... The aims and objects of the Indian National Congress are based upon an ignorance of history and present-day realities; they do not take into consideration that India is inhabited by different nationalities; ...... I consider the experiment which the Indian National Congress wants to make fraught with dangers and suffering for all the nationalities of India, specially for the Muslims. The Muslims are in a minority, but they are a highly united minority. At least traditionally they are prone to take the sword in hand when the majority oppresses them. If this happens, it will bring about disasters greater than the ones which came in the wake of the happenings of

1857. . . . . The Congress cannot rationally prove its claim to represent the opinions, ideals, and aspirations of the Muslims."[36a]

As an indication of the change that came over Syed Ahmad it may be mentioned that though in 1877 he supported the simultaneous examinations for civil service, as mentioned above, he opposed it as a member of the Public Service Commission in 1887.

Whatever one might think of the early isolated utterances of Syed Ahmad in favour of the peoples of India forming but one nation, the two-nation theory formed the solid basis of the Aligarh Movement. Its political views and ideals, as they took definite shape, may be formulated in the following four fundamental principles:

(a) The Hindus and Muslims form two separate political entities with separate outlook and conflicting interests.

(b) The grant of representative institutions based on democratic principles, and appointment to high offices by open competitive examination in India would be detrimental to the interests of the Muslims, as they would be subject to Hindu domination which is far worse than British rule.

(c) Consequently, the Muslims should regard the paramountcy of the British as the chief safeguard of their interests, and keep themselves aloof from political agitation against the Government.

(d) As the Muslim interests are quite safe in the hands of the British, the Muslims should confine their attention to cultural development, and avoid politics except in so far as it is necessary to counterbalance the mischief of Hindu political agitators.[37]

In support of the last two points it may be pointed out that he declined to support the "National Mohammadan Association" founded in Calcutta in 1877 by Amir Ali Khan and a young group of Muhammadans, as mentioned above.

The Muhammadan Anglo-Oriental College at Aligarh became the chief centre for disseminating these political principles. The Muhammadan Anglo-Oriental College Fund Committee, of which Syed Ahmad was Honorary Secretary for life, laid down, as a definite rule, that subscriptions should be asked from Muslims and Christians, the people of the Book, but from no others.

The Principals of the Aligarh College proved to be active agents for propagating the political ideas mentioned above. The first Principal, Theodore Beck, "gave up a life and career in England, and devoted himself to the service of the Muhammadans of India" and was their "faithful friend". He took charge of the *Institute Gazette*, the literary organ of the Aligarh College, and edited it on behalf of Syed Ahmad. He poured forth venoms on the Bengalis for their advanced political and social ideas. In issue after issue he published political articles, whose central idea was that India contained two or more nations, that Parliamentary government was unsuited to India, and in the event of its being granted, the Hindus, who formed the majority, "would be absolute masters as no Muhammadan Emperor ever was."[38]

When, in 1889, Charles Bradlaugh introduced a Bill in the British House of Commons for setting up democratic form of Government in India, Beck prepared a memorial on behalf of the Muslims and proceeded to Delhi with a batch of his Aligarh students. These were posted at the gate of Jummia Masjid and, after a Friday Prayer, induced more than twenty thousand Muslims to sign the memorial, falsely representing it to be a petition against the attempt of the Hindus to put a stop to cow-slaughter.[39]

It was mainly through Beck's efforts that "in August, 1888, was established the United Indian Patriotic Association at Aligarh in which both Hindus and Musalmans joined. The objects of the Association were: (1) to inform the members of Parliament and the people of England through newspapers and tracts that all the communities of India, the aristocracy and the Princes were not with the Congress and to contradict its statements; (2) to keep the Parliament and the people of England informed about the opinions of Hindu and Muslim organizations which were opposed to the Congress; and (3) to help in the maintenance of law and order and the strengthening of the British rule in India and to wean away people from the Congress. This whole scheme was the result of Mr. Beck's efforts and he and Sir Syed were put in charge of it. A branch of the Association was opened in England at the house of Mr. Morrison who subsequently became the Principal of Aligarh College after Mr. Beck's death."[40]

The United Indian Patriotic Association continued to oppose the Congress in the name of Musalmans for some years, but a joint organization of Hindus and Muslims was not to the liking of Beck. So under his inspiration a new organization under the name of 'Muhammadan Anglo-Oriental Defence Association of Upper India' was founded at a meeting of some influential Muslims held on December 30, 1893, at the house of Syed Ahmad. In his opening address Beck said that "he was not in favour of political agitation, as it would lead the Musalmans away from their tried and beneficial course of loyalty to the British Government. But, all the same, he felt the need of an organisation to give political lead to the young Muslims. He explained, 'with the press pouring out a stream of political articles, our young educated Mahomedans will be drawn into the current to support or oppose the measures proposed.....I think it would be a mistake to leave them without guidance.' It was in consequence of this advice that the Defence Association was set up through a resolution passed to that effect in the same gathering."[41]

The main objects of the Association were: (a) to place the opinions of Musalmans before Englishmen and the Government of India and to protect their political rights; (b) to prevent political agitation from spreading among the Musalmans; and (c) to strengthen British rule in India. In this new organization, of which Beck became the Secretary, Musalmans were separated from all other Indian communities except the Englishmen. The name 'Defence Association' was borrowed from the Anglo-Indian Defence Association which had been established in 1883 at the time of the Ilbert Bill agitation, but had ceased to exist after completing its work.[42]

Beck made a systematic effort to divide the Hindus and Muslims. As an illustration we may quote the following extract: "The objective of the Congress is to transfer the political control of the country from the British to the Hindus. It demands the repeal of the Arms Act, reduction of military expenditure, and the consequential weakening of the frontier defences. Musalmans can have no sympathy with these demands......It is imperative for the Muslims and the British to unite with a view to fighting these agitators and prevent the introduction of democratic form of government, unsuited as it is to the needs and genius of the country. We therefore, advocate loyalty to the Government and Anglo-Muslim collaboration."[43]

"In 1895, Beck proceeded to England where he addressed the annual meeting of the London Branch of the Association. A summary of his speech was published in the *Aligarh College Magazine* of March, April and June, 1895. According to it, Beck said that (1) a friendship between the British people and the Muslims was possible, but not between Muslims and followers of other religions; for example, the followers of Shivaji and those of Guru Govind Singh would never agree with the Muslims in accepting Aurangzeb as their hero; (2) Muslims would never accept a system of government in which the Hindu majority would rule over them; the Muslims of Kashmir who were living under the yoke of Brahmin officers envied the good fortune of the Muslims who were living happily under the British rule; (3) Indians themselves did not like a democratic system; they preferred monarchy; (4) Muslim behaviour during and after the Revolt (of 1857) had warned the community against agitational politics of Hindus, and they were now wisely acting on the advice of Sir Syed—it was the advice of loyalty to the British; (5) Muslims were opposed to the holding of the competitive examinations in India, for they knew that this step would mean the replacement of many impartial British officers by anti-Muslim Hindus."[43a]

Beck's contribution to the anti-Hindu bias in Aligarh Movement was very considerable. The personal influence exerted by Beck upon Syed Ahmad was believed to be so great that one Muslim writer humorously remarked that "the College is of Syed Ahmad and the order is of Beck".

A notorious instance of such influence is afforded by the abuses of the Bengalis in which Beck indulged in his articles in the *Aligarh Institute Gazette.* His anonymous articles were attributed to Syed Ahmad who was the editor of the *Gazette.* Reference has been made above to the high tributes paid by Syed Ahmad to the Bengalis, and the very fact that he allowed the publication of Beck's articles is a measure of the latter's influence upon him. The latitude he allowed to Beck was probably also partly due to the fact that he himself was gradually alienated from the Bengalis on account of their advanced political views. But there seems to be little doubt that Beck's influence was also at work.

Beck died in 1899, and his services, not merely as a friend and benefactor of the Muhammadans, but also as a builder of the British empire (on the solid basis of Hindu-Muslim split) were appreciated in high quarters. Sir Arthur Strachey, I.C.S., paid the following obituary tribute to Beck: "An Englishman who was engaged in the consolidation of the empire has disappeared from the scene."[43b] Beck was succeeded as Principal by Morrison, who was in charge of the London office of the Muhammadan Anglo-Oriental Defence Association. Morrison, who continued in this post till 1905, was an apt pupil of Beck, but he was alarmed at the growing political solidarity among the Muslims. So he tried to wean away the Muslims from political agitation and divert their energies to the educational and economic uplift of their community.

Thanks to the efforts of the founder and the first two Principals of the Aligarh College, an open manifestation of hostility against the Indian National Congress formed the basic creed of the Aligarh Movement.

Syed Ahmad regarded the Congress as inimical to the true interests of the Muslims. He even went further and wrote in the *Pioneer*, on 2-3 November, 1887, that the Parliamentary form of government was "unsuited to a country containing two or more nations tending to oppress the numerically weaker."[43c] During 1888, Tyabji and Hume constantly endeavoured to secure his conciliation with the Congress. Sir Syed gave Tyabji a stunning reply. He said: "I do not understand what the words 'National Congress' mean. Is it supposed that the different castes and creeds living in India belong to one nation, or can become a nation, and their aims and aspirations be one and the same? I think it is quite impossible, and when it is impossible there can be no such thing as a National Congress, nor can it be of equal benefit to all peoples. You regard the doings of the misnamed National Congress beneficial to India, but I am sorry to say that I regard them as not only injurious to our own community but also to India at large. I object to every Congress in any shape or form whatever which regards India as one nation." Tyabji again wrote a persuasive letter, and again failed.[43d]

According to Syed Ahmad, 'the Congress was in reality a civil war without arms'. "The ultimate object of the Congress was to rule the country; and although they wished to do it in the name of all people of India, the Muslims would be helpless as they would be in a minority." Again he observed, "that a 'national' Congress could not be composed of two nations who had such different opinions and only happened to agree on some small points."[43e] In short, Syed Ahmad looked upon the Congress as a machinery devised by the Hindus to further their own interests at the cost of the Muslims. Hence we find an insistent opposition to the Congress from Syed Ahmad and his school. There were Muslim leaders like Badruddin Tyabji and Rahimatullah Sayani in Bombay, Nawab Syed Mahomed Bahadur in Madras, A. Rasul in Bengal, Maulvi Mazar-ul-Haq in Bihar, and others who regarded themselves as Indians first and Muslims afterwards. They wholeheartedly supported the Congress, but their number was few, and their followers, fewer still. In general, it may be said that the Muslims of Northern India, at any rate, were firmly attached to the policy of Syed Ahmad.

Many leaders of the Congress were, however, loath to admit this patent truth. The official history of the Congress denies that the Muslims were opposed to the Congress. It makes much of the fact that "Sheik Raza Hussein Khan produced at the fourth session (1888, Allahabad) a *fatwa* supporting the Congress from the Shams-ul-ulma, the leader of the Sunni community of Lucknow", and declared that "it is not the Muslims but their official masters who are opposed to the Congress."[44] A reference to the number of Muslim delegates present at the different sessions of the Congress, and the part which they took in its deliberations, would give us a true idea of the real interest taken by the Muslims as a class in the progress of Indian National Congress. These statistics, which will be found in Ch. XV, undoubtedly go against the position maintained in the official history of the Congress. Even some of the stalwarts of the Congress in those days regretfully admitted the hostile attitude of the

Muslims towards the Congress. Thus Surendra-nath Banerji writes: "The Muhammadan community, under the leadership of Sir Syed Ahmad, had held aloof from the Congress. They were working under the auspices of the Patriotic Association in direct opposition to the national movement. Our critics regarded the National Congress as a Hindu Congress, and the opposition papers described it as such. We were straining every nerve to secure the co-operation of our Muhammadan fellow-countrymen in this great national work. We sometimes paid the fares of Muhammadan delegates and offered them other facilities."[45] Even Gokhale remarked in one of his letters that "seventy millions of Muhammadans were more or less hostile to national aspirations".[46]

The anti-Congress policy was clearly laid down by Syed Ahmad in his public speeches, the most notable of them being one at Lakhnau on December 28, 1887, and another at Mirat on March 16, 1888. An extract from the latter has been quoted above.[46a] At Lakhnau he told the assembled Muslims, on the eve of the Congress session at Madras: "If you accept that the country should groan under the yoke of Bengali rule and its people lick the Bengali shoes, then, in the name of God! jump into the train, sit down, and be off to Madras, be off to Madras."[46b] Referring to these speeches M. Noman remarks that "No Mussalman of India since then joined the Congress except one or two. Even Syed Ahmad Khan's co-religionists who differed from his views on religious, educational and social matters and opposed him violently, followed him in politics and preserved their isolation from the Congress."[47]

There is no doubt that Syed Ahmad succeeded in keeping back the bulk of Muslims from the Congress. They made no secret of the reasons for their action. In 1896, Rahimatullah Sayani, a distinguished Muslim, presided over the Congress session. Haji Muhammad Ismail Khan, a friend of Syed Ahmad, suggested to the Congress President that the Congress should pass a resolution to the effect that the Hindus and Muslims should have equal number of seats in the legislative councils, district-boards, and municipalities. This showed where the shoe pinched. Sayani could not accept Ismail Khan's proposal. Syed Ahmad, however, endorsed it, and wrote in an article that the Muslims could join the Congress only if the Congress agreed to the proposal of Ismail Khan.[47a]

As a matter of fact, it is quite evident from a perusal of the contemporary records that almost "all the leading Muslim institutions and personalities joined hands in their indignation against the Indian National Congress. Resolutions condemning the Congress were passed by the Musalmans of Allahabad, Lucknow, Meerut, Lahore, Madras and other places. *The Mahomedan Observer, The Victoria Paper, The Muslim Herald, The Rafiq-i-Hind* and the *Imperial Paper* —all spoke with one voice against the Indian National Congress. The *Aligarh Institute Gazette,* a powerful Muslim organ of Northern India, never missed the opportunity of reprinting all sorts of views opposed to the Congress ideology from other newspapers and magazines. The Central National Muhammadan Association of Bengal, the Muhammadan Literary Society of Calcutta, the Anjuman-i-Islamia of Madras, the Dindigal Anjuman and the Muhammadan Central Association, Punjab, denounced, in the strongest possible terms, Congress aims and activities".[48] Important Muslim organizations in India refused to send delegates to the Congress when invited to do so.

Syed Ahmad's opposition to the Congress was not confined to verbal protests. He also took practical steps to check its rising popularity by the foundation of the United Indian Patriotic Association, and the Muhammadan Anglo-Oriental Defence Association to which reference has been made above.

It is also not without significance that Syed Ahmad laid the foundation of the Annual Muslim Educational Conference, in 1886, only a year after the establishment of the National Congress. This conference was held each year at different places in India exactly at the time when the Congress held its sessions. Although its main object was the discussion of the general and educational condition of the Indian Musalmans, it became also a forum for the dissemination of Muslim political opinions. By the gradual progress of this annual conference, the Muslims hoped to overspread "the whole of upper India with a network of societies, committees and individuals, all working harmoniously in the great cause, so that a big evil may be dealt with by a strong remedy and by the vigorous work of one generation the tide of misfortune may be turned and the *Mohamedan Nation* may be set moving on the tide of progress abreast of all the other Nations of India."[49]

Abbas S. Tyabji, Bar-at-Law, pointed out the real cause of Muhammadan aloofness and correctly exposed the unreasoning fear of the Muslims when he wrote: "The real reason is that the Mahomedan minority has a fear that it will not be dealt with fairly by the Hindu majority. Now I ask this question: has the Congress pressed for any rights during the last 25 years which would have specially benefited the Hindus at the expense of the Mahomedans? If it had, my Mahomedan brothren may rest assured that men like the late Mr. Justice Tyabji, Nawab Syed Mahomed and others, would not have kept up their connections with the Congress movement."[50]

R. M. Sayani, President of the Congress in 1896, made an elaborate analysis of the probable causes of Muslim discontent against the Congress, as noted above,[51] and proceeded to reply to each of them. The Congress also lost no opportunity to placate the Muslims as far as possible without surrendering its basic principles. An instance is afforded by the third session of the Congress held in Madras in 1887. At this session of the Congress a member gave notice of a Resolution urging the prohibition of cow-slaughter. The Congress was in great difficulty, as the feeling of the Muhammadans on this question was only too well-known, and it was fully realized that the Resolution would raise a question of great difficulty and delicacy. The Congress found a solution that was fair to all interests, and was accepted by all parties, and which has since been the recognized convention of the Congress. It was decided that if any Resolution affecting a particular class or community was objected to by the delegates representing that community, even though they were in a minority, it should not be considered by the Congress.[52]

But all this was in vain. Nothing could bring round Syed Ahmad to support the Congress. After his death in 1898 his mantle fell upon Nawab Mohsin-ul-Mulk who, too, followed the same policy. This spirit of animosity against the Congress gradually brought in its train a general spirit of opposition to the Hindus.

This spirit was further embittered by other measures, such as the propaganda initiated in Mahārāshṭra against the killing of cows. Far more serious was the unfortunate and protracted controversy over Urdu *vs.* Hindī, originating from a movement begun by the Hindus in Varanasi as early as 1867 to replace Urdu by Hindī and the Arabic script by Nāgarī. This movement convinced Syed Ahmad that the Hindus and Muslims could never "join whole-heartedly together and the differences between them would immensely increase in future." Nawab Mohsin-ul-Mulk even adopted a militant attitude. "Although", he said, "we have not the might of pen, our hands are still strong enough to wield the might of the sword."[53]

Both the Aligarh Movement and its founder have been severely criticised and condemned by a class of writers, mostly Hindu. They rightly point out that this Movement was responsible for bringing about that conflict between the Hindus and Muslims which culminated in the foundation of Pakistan. But it is necessary to look at the Movement, fairly and squarely, from the point of view of the Muslims for whom it was primarily intended. There can be no gainsaying the fact that the Aligarh Movement was to the Muslims what the Renaissance and Nationalist Movement of the 19th century was to the Hindus. It raised the Muslim community from the slough of despondency in which it had sunk after the Mutiny, and transformed it from the Medieval to the Modern Age. Syed Ahmad, who ushered in this Movement, deserves the highest praise for his love of the community and the far-sighted vision which he displayed regarding the problem of the Muslims. He did for his community something like what Raja Rammohan Roy did for the Hindus. He tried to introduce English education among the Muslims as he held, like the Raja, that that was the only way of removing the prejudices and superstitions which had accumulated in course of ages and retarded the healthy growth of the Muslims on modern lines. He had also introduced reforms in social customs and religious ideas. For all this he had to engage in a hard fight with the orthodox Muslims, specially the Maulavis, and it must be said to his credit that he fought, sometimes almost single-handed, against enormous odds that at one time almost threatened to ruin him. It is a great tribute to his personality that, although not quite well versed in English, he appreciated its importance for his community, and very rightly held that no true progress is possible for the Muslims until and unless they made up for their slackness in the past and imbibed English education and Western rationalism in very much the same way as the Hindus did. We can, therefore, understand why he laid so much stress on the educational propaganda, and deliberately avoided politics so far as the Muslims were concerned. When he started his crusade for Western education, the total number of Muslim graduates was only 26 against 1,652 in Hindu community. He was of the opinion that Muslims could advance in education only with the help of the Government, and so long as they did not make sufficient progress, it would be unnecessarily diverting their energy to join in the political movement, with the additional risk of incurring the displeasure of the Government. This, to a certain extent, explains also his opposition to the Indian National Congress. There were other grounds for his anti-Congress policy. In the first place, he had an innate sense of loyalty to the British, and the terrible consequences of the Mutiny, of which he was an eye-witness, probably warned him that the time was not ripe for any sort of opposition against the British Government. He also knew the temper of the Muslims and was justly afraid that their opposition to the Government might not be confined to passing Resolutions, as in the Congress, but might stir up the latent spirit of revolution and end in overt acts of rebellion which would again expose the Muslims to the same severe repression which followed the Wahabi Movement and the Sepoy Mutiny of 1857. Above all, he held that the Muslims must be mature by their education before they could fruitfully join politics. The trend and net result of his policy was undoubtedly to widen the cleavage between the two great communities, but perhaps it would be more correct to say that he was not so much anti-Hindu as pro-Muslim. He might well say, like the great Roman, Brutus, that it was not that he loved the Hindus less, but that he loved the Muslims more. The one and only aim of his life was to promote the Muslim interests, come what may.

Some apologists of Syed Ahmad have been at pains to prove that his anti-national, anti-Hindu and anti-Congress policy was entirely due to the advice of Beck.[54] This view is no doubt based on, and seeks to explain, the striking contrasts between Syed Ahmad's liberal views of earlier period and communal policy of a later date. It should be remembered, however, that Beck came to Aligarh in 1883, but, as has been noted above, the reactionary views of Syed Ahmad may be traced to an earlier period, and liberal views even after 1883. Besides, it is permissible to doubt whether such a strong personality as Syed Ahmad possessed could be entirely dominated and led to a radically different policy by another individual. Beck undoubtedly exercised strong influence upon Syed Ahmad, as noted above, but it was possible for him to do so only because the fundamental ideas of both followed the same direction.

Whatever we might think of Beck's influence, there is no doubt that from 1880 right up to 1898 when Sir Syed Ahmad died, he was the pivot round whom the Muslim politics moved. It is also a point worth remembering that his view, including the policy towards the Hindus and the Congress, was fully approved by almost all the Muslim leaders, including some of those who later strutted on the stage of Indian politics as the great champions of Hindu-Muslim unity and Indian nationhood. Even so late as 1923, Muhammad Ali, then reputed to be the greatest nationalist of India among the Muslims, observed in his Presidential Address at the Congress: "Reviewing the actions of a bygone generation to-day when it is easier to be wise after the event, I must confess I still think the attitude of Syed Ahmad Khan was eminently wise, and much as I wish that some things which he had said should have been left unsaid, I am constrained to admit that no well-wisher of Mussalmans, nor of India as a whole, could have followed a very different course in leading the Mussalmans."

III. DIVIDE AND RULE.

The activities of Beck and his successors should not be treated as mere personal or isolated incidents. They coincide with a deliberate change of policy on the part of the Government of India in favour of the Muslims. The policy of *Devide and Rule* is as old in human history as imperialism itself, and it would have been strange indeed if the British empire-builders in India were immune from it. Actually it can be traced as far back as 1821, when a British officer, signing himself *Carnaticus*, wrote in the *Asiatic Journal: "Divide et Impera* should be the motto of our Indian administration, whether political, civil or military". Lt. John Coke, Commandant at Moradabad, wrote at the time of the Sepoy Mutiny: "Our endeavours should be to uphold in full force the (for us fortunate) separation which exists between the different religions and races, not to endeavour to amalgamate them. *Divide et Impera* should be the principle of Indian Government." Lord Elphinstone, Governor of Bombay, wrote in a minute dated May 14, 1859: *"Divide et Impera* was the old Roman motto and it should be ours." Sir John Strachey, another eminent British Civilian, observed: "The existence, side by side, of hostile creeds among the Indian people is one of the strong points in our political position in India."[55]

The policy of *Divide and Rule* was also pursued during the Mutiny, when the Sikhs and the Gurkhas were pitted against the other Indians. The success of the policy and its future possibilities did not escape the vigilant eyes of the English statesmen. Sir John Seeley wrote: "You see the mutiny was in a great measure put down by turning the races of India against each other. So long as this can be done, the government of India from England is possible, and there is nothing miraculous about it. But........if the state of things should alter, if by any chance the population should be welded into a single nationality, then I do not say we ought to begin to fear for our dominion; I say we ought to cease at once to hope it."[56] Sir John Lawrence echoed the sentiment of Sir Syed noted above,[57] when he said: "Among the defects of the pre-Mutiny army, unquestionably the worst, and the one that operated most fatally against us, was the brotherhood and homogeneity of the Bengal army, and for this purpose the remedy is counterpoise; firstly the great counterpoise of the Europeans, and secondly of the native races."[58]

Actually, as noted above, the Indian army was reorganized after the Mutiny according to this principle. "In the old army, men stood by chance in the ranks, Hindu and Musalman, Poorbeah and Punjabi, cheek by jowl. The object aimed at in the new constructions was, to some extent, to put the races into watertight compartments." Accordingly, the majority of the new regiments became class-company ones (where different races should be kept in different companies in the same regiments), but a few Sikh and Gurkha corps remained entirely homogeneous (class regiments)."[59]

At first the policy of *Divide and Rule* worked in favour of the Hindus. For, as the British dispossessed the Muslim rulers they naturally looked upon the Muslims as their enemies and favoured the Hindus as a counterpoise to them. A clear enunciation of this policy was made by Lord Ellenborough. Writing to the Duke of Wellington from Simla on October 4, 1842, after the fall of Kabul and Ghazni, he remarked that while the Muslims, as a class, desired the failure of the English in Afghanistan, the Hindus were delighted, and then observed: "It seems to me most unwise, when we are sure of the hostility of one-tenth, not to secure the enthusiastic support of the nine-tenths which are faithful." Again, writing to Wellington on January 18, 1843, Ellenborough said: "I cannot close my eyes to the belief that that race (Mussalman) is fundamentally hostile to us, and therefore our true policy is to conciliate the Hindus."[60]

This anti-Muslim and pro-Hindu feeling was further developed after the Sepoy Mutiny of 1857, as the British regarded the Muslims as its chief instigators. Thus H. H. Thomas (retired I.C.S.) observed that "the Hindus were not the contrivers or the primary movers of the (1857) rebelion;...it was the result of a Muhammadan conspiracy."[61] Reference has been made above[62] to similar views expressed by Charles Raikes and others.

But with the development of political ideas and national consciousness among the Hindus, they came to be regarded as a serious menace to the stability of the British rule and the Government realized the necessity of putting a check to this danger. The Muslims had given up their truculent attitude against the British and had not yet developed the national spirit with which half a century of Western education had imbued the Hindus. It was obvious that the Muslims could now be safely played against the Hindus. Hunter's famous book, *The Indian Musalmans*, published in 1871, is an eloquent advocacy of this new policy. It was at this juncture that the Muslims also were ready, under Syed Ahmad's leadership, to place implicit faith upon the benevolence of the Government. Syed Ahmad's appeal to the British Government to take the Muslims under their aegis, therefore, found ready response and it was successful to a far greater degree than he ever could possibly hope.

This policy of favouring the Muslims as a counterpoise against the Hindus was gradually adopted by the British during the eighties and nineties. On 14 January, 1887, Lord Cross, the Secretary of State, wrote to the Viceroy, Lord Dufferin, in connection with the abstention of the Muhammadans from the Indian National Congress that "this division of religious feeling is to our advantage." It was also clearly indicated by Lord Dufferin in some of his speeches. In these he elaborated for the first time the theory of the special importance of the Muslims in Indian politics, which was to play such an important role in future. He reminded them 'that their forefathers had entered India through the north-western passes, and they should therefore realise, more than anybody else, the importance and duty of guarding that route against future invaders'. He did not stop with this astute diplomatic way of rousing their national feeling against the Hindus. Proceeding further, he told them that "fifty millions of men are themselves a nation,—and a very powerful nation."[63] Lord Salisbury said in a public speech that it would be impossible for England to hand over the Indian Muslims to the tender mercies of a hostile numerical majority.[63a]

It is not strange, therefore, that the principle of separate representation for the Muslims should be adopted in the Indian Councils Act of 1892. Dr. Ambedkar observes:

"The introduction of this principle is shrouded in mystery. It is mystery because it was introduced so silently and so stealthily. The principle of separate representation does not find a place in the Act. The Act says nothing about it. It was in the directions—but not in the Act—issued to those charged with the duty of framing regulations as to the classes and interests to whom representation was to be given that the Muslims were named as a class to be provided for.

"It is a mystery as to who was responsible for its introduction. This scheme of separate representation was not the result of any demand put forth by any organized Muslim association. In whom did it then originate? It is suggested that it originated with the Viceroy, Lord Dufferin, who, as far back as the year 1888, when dealing with the question of representation in the Legislative Councils, emphasized the necessity that in India representation will have to be, not in the way representation is secured in England, but representation by interests. Curiosity leads to a further question, namely, what could have led Lord Dufferin to propose such a plan? It is suggested that the idea was to wean away the Musalmans from the Congress which had already been started three years before. Be that as it may, it is certain that it is by this Act that separate representation for Muslims became, for the first time, a feature of the Indian Constitution. It should, however, be noted that neither the Act nor the Regulations conferred any right of selection upon the Muslim community, nor did the Act give the Muslim community a right to claim a fixed number of seats. All that it did was to give the Muslims the right to separate representation."[63b]

Since the days of Dufferin and Salisbury the policy of favouring the Muslims grew apace and Sir Bamfylde Fuller merely gave formal and official expression to a bare truth when he represented the Hindus and the Muslims as his two wives, the latter being the favourite one. Those who are familiar with the stories of *Suo-rani* and *Duo-rani* (favoured and discarded queens) in Indian folk-tales will easily understand the full implication of this. The 'Divide and Rule jackboot' was still there—only it was on the other leg.

The Indian politicians could not be unaware of the new policy of the Government of India. When the Congress met in Calcutta in 1890, the Chairman of the Reception Committee remarked in his address that the British policy of *Divide and Rule* was unworthy of the great English people and was fraught with grave danger to the safety of the British Empire.

This aspect of the problem also struck some British statesmen. Shortly after the Congress session in Calcutta in December, 1886, the *Muslim Observer* stated that only seven Muslims joined it and that the statement of the Congress leaders that a large number of Muslims joined it was a lie. Lord Dufferin had already begun to dislike the Congress and his views were shared by Lord Cross, the Secretary of State. So Dufferin sent a cutting from the above paper to Lord Cross with a covering letter dated 4 January, 1887, in which he wrote: "You will have observed that the Mahomedans have abstained from taking any part in the Indian National Congress. They have done this, I understand, entirely in accordance with their own views of what is politic, and not at all under any pressure from the officials. Indeed I do not think we could make a greater mistake than to sow the seeds of dissension, suspicion or jealousy between any classes of Her Majesty's subjects. Such a policy would in the long run recoil upon our own heads. What the Mahomedans feel is that under a Bengalee Constitution they would be more completely left out in the cold than they are at present."[63c]

Lord Dufferin's disclaimer does not carry immediate conviction. We have seen how the anti-Hindu and anti-Congress spirit of the Muslims was encouraged—not to put it more bluntly—by Mr. Beck, the Principal of the Aligarh College, and others of his ilk; and from what we know of the mentality of the British officials, it is difficult to believe that they were absolutely neutral in the matter. The very fact that Dufferin went out of his way to declare that there was no official pressure shows that there were genuine suspicions about it.

His own speeches, reminding the importance of the Muslims as a separate nation, was also certainly calculated to alienate them from the Hindus. In any case, Lord Cross was "very glad that the Mahomedans have so distinctly kept aloof from the Congress."

The warning of Dufferin was not, however, heeded by the Home Government. How their mind worked is best seen in the following extract from a letter which Lord Hamilton, the Secretary of State, wrote to Lord Elgin, the Viceroy, on May 7, 1897: "I am sorry to hear of the increasing friction between Hindus and Mahomedans in the N.W. and the Punjab. One hardly knows what to wish for—unity of ideas and action would be very dangerous politically, divergence of ideas and collision are administratively troublesome. Of the two the latter is the least risky, though it throws anxiety and responsibility upon those on the spot where the friction exists."

In an earlier letter, dated 3 October, 1895, Hamilton wrote to Elgin: "Sandhurst (Governor of Bombay) sent me some details about the riot at Dhulia. The Mahomedans were clearly in the wrong. These outbreaks are, from administrative point of view, regrettable, but they do seem to me to strengthen our position generally as reminders of what was the condition of India before our authority was there established and what it would be if abolished."

These two letters show how in a cold, calculating spirit the British Government welcomed the tension between the Hindus and Musalmans as a safeguard of the British empire even at the risk of administrative difficulties and inconvenience. Of course, the moral side of the question does not seem to have ever troubled them. In the course of a decade, *Divide and Rule* was adopted as the official policy of the British Government during the Viceroyalty of Lord Minto, as will be shown in the next volume.

IV. HINDU-MUSLIM RELATIONS

The contribution of the British rule to the cleavage between the Hindus and Muslims should be considered in its proper perspective. It must be frankly admitted that the roots of the cleavage lay deep in the soil, and it was already manifest even early in the nineteenth century. The British did not create it, but merely exploited the patent fact to serve their own interests. Reference has been made above to the growing difference between the elites of the two communities, even before a fillip was given to it either by the Aligarh Movement or the definite policy of *Divide and Rule* adopted by the British Government. The relations among the masses, though normally cordial, occasionally took a very ugly turn in the shape of communal riots, showing that the volcanic mountains, calm on the surface, had not altogether lost their eruptive tendency and power. Early in the nineteenth century there was such a violent outbreak in Varanasi (Banaras). In October, 1809, the Hindu mob of the city stormed the great mosque of Aurangzeb. Though well-authenticated details are lacking, it is reported that about fifty mosques were destroyed, the city was given up to pillage and slaughter, and a large number of Muslims were put to death.[64] In 1820 the Muslims assaulted a Durga Puja procession in Calcutta.

Communal riots and tensions during the great outbreak of 1857 have been noted above.[65] Hindu-Muslim riots with heavy casualties occurred at Bareilly and other localities in U.P. during 1871-2.[66] Two such riots took place in Bombay.

An article in a magazine, edited by a Parsi youth, gave an account of the Prophet of Arabia which lacked "that sentiment of respect and tolerance which is due to a sister community". The lithographed portrait of the Prophet, which was given with the article, also gave umbrage, and "an undiscovered villain added fuel to the fire by posting a copy of the picture, with ribald and obscene remarks underneath, on the main entrance of the principal mosque." Large crowds of Muhammadans assembled in the mosques of the town with the Qur'an in one hand and a knife in the other. At a meeting held on October 7, 1851, they proclaimed a *Jihād* (holy war) against the Parsis. They overwhelmed the small police force on duty and marched triumphantly to the Parsi quarters of the Bombay town. The Parsis were "belaboured mercilessly by the rioters". "For weeks together, that part of Bombay was a scene of pillage and destruction, and the Parsis had to put up with shocking atrocities such as defilement of corpses". "Only after the editor had been compelled to tender a written apology a truce was declared". "In connection with this disturbance the Parsi community looked in vain to the police for protection. If not altogether hostile, they were indifferent. Dādabhai Naoroji, who witnessed the tragedy, hastened the publication of the '*Rast Goftar*' and wrote strong articles against the Government for indifference and failure of duty. He also rebuked the cowardly Parsi leaders for having tamely submitted to such outrages."[67]

Another riot took place in 1874 of which there is an eye-witness' account by the great Indian leader Pherozeshah Mehta.[67a]. In a book written by a Parsi vaccinator there was a reference to the Prophet which was regarded as objectionable by the Muslims. The publication was accordingly suppressed by the Government and the author was made to apologize for any affront he might have inadvertently offered. Nevertheless, there was "a brutal and unwarranted attack on Parsis by a mob of Mohamedans", on 13 February,

1874. They "invaded Parsi places of worship, tore up the prayer-books, extinguished the sacred fires and subjected the fire-temples to various indignities. Parsis were attacked in the streets and in their houses and free fights took place all over the city. Thanks to the weakness and supineness of the police and the Government, hooliganism had full play and considerable loss of life and damage to property were caused". The riot continued for several days till the military was called out.

Pherozeshah Mehta, like Dadabhai Naoroji, none of whom one would accuse of having any special animosity against the Muslims or the British Government, has laid emphasis on the callousness of the police and the indifference of the Government. "The attitude of the Commissioner of Police was particularly hostile and objectionable. The Governor told a Parsi deputation that waited on him that the conduct of the community had been injudicious and unconciliatory and advised it to make its peace with the Muhammadans and to learn the lesson of defending itself without dependence on the authorities."

Communal disturbances grew in volume and frequency, particularly between the years 1885 and 1893. Serious communal riots broke out at Lahore and Karnal (1885), Delhi (1886) where military had to be requisitioned, Hoshiarpur, Ludhiana, Ambala, Dera Ghazi Khan (1889), and Palakod in the Salem District of Madras (1891). The year 1893 was one of the worst and there were grave outbreaks over a large area in Azamgarh District (U.P.), Bombay town (lasted for 6 days) and interior, and Isa Khel (Mianwalli District, Punjab). Muharram and Dusserah processions, and cow-killing at Baqr'id were the causes, and murders, demolition of mosques and temples, and looting of shops, the chief characteristics of these riots.[68] Detailed accounts of a few riots are given in the Appendix. It is not perhaps unreasonable to assume that this increased tension between the masses of the two communities was the direct consequence of the growing cleavage between their leaders.

Thus towards the end of the period under review the Hindus and Muslims represented almost two opposite camps in politics, and the ground was prepared for this, throughout the nineteenth century, by the frankly communal outlook of the Muslims, both in their general political evolution as well as in the Wahabi and Aligarh movements. The Muslim political ideas were generally inspired by the consideration of purely Muslim interests. But in forming a proper estimate of the Muslim politics in the nineteenth century it would be unfair to look at it only from the standpoint of modern nationalist outlook, and several important factors, which are generally overlooked, should be taken into consideration.

In the first place, it should be remembered that neither the Wahabi nor the Aligarh Movement represented the Muslim community as a whole. Large elements stood outside both, and even in the heyday of Aligrah Movement, the masses were mostly indifferent, and a number of distinguished Muslims co-operated in political matters with the Hindus.

Secondly, if the Muslims were communal and lacking in an all-India outlook, the Hindus were partly responsible for this. The Hindu intelligentsia cherished a definitely anti-Muslim bias from the very beginning of the nineteenth century, as has been noted above,[69] though some of them, like Peary-chand Mitra, realized the need of a united front and publicly expressed this view. It is not without significance that the formation of a Muhammadan Association in 1856 (or 1855) was welcomed by the British Indian Association. The Hindus regarded it as quite natural, and evidently looked upon the Muslims as a separate political unit. Far more significant is the justification offered by the authorities of the Hindu Mela for forming a National Society. To the objection that a Society with membership confined to Hindus could hardly be called national, the *National Paper* answered as follows on December 4, 1872: "We do not understand why our correspondent takes exception to the Hindus who certainly form a nation by themselves, and as such a society established by them can very properly be called a National Society."[69a] No wonder that soon after the foundation of the Hindu Mela and National Society, the National Muhammadan Association was founded in Calcutta. It would be obvious from the above that while genuinely all-India national outlook was not altogether absent, there was a general feeling among large sections of both Hindus and Muhammadans that they formed two separate political units or nations.

Thirdly, it is to be considered very carefully why the Hindus gradually outgrew this narrow separatist tendency and imbibed a truly national spirit, while the Muslims failed to do so during the period under review. The Hindus had a start of at least half a century over the Muslims in their political evolution, and this margin of time should be normally allowed for similar development. But there were special difficulties in the adoption of a national outlook by the Muslims. They were in a hopeless minority as compared with the Hindus, and in any democratic form of government, they were sure to occupy only a position of secondary importance. As noted above, this view was publicly expressed at the time of the legislation for local self-government. This apprehension of the Hindus obtaining superior authority would naturally increase with every advance of self-government on democratic lines. The same fear worked upon the minds of the Muslims even in comparatively minor matters like recruitment to higher posts by open competitive examination, which was strongly advocated by the Hindus. Nobody could deny that it was the best mode of recruitment that could be conceived, but the Muslims opposed it on the ground that these were sure to be filled up mostly by the Hindus, not only because they were more numerous, but also because they were more advanced in education.

This feeling was brought to a head at the evidence given before the Public Service Commission in 1886. In his evidence Dadabhai Naoroji urged the necessity of holding simultaneous examinations in England and India. This was, however, strongly opposed by the Muslims "who feared that an examination held in India would lead to a preponderance of Hindus in the Civil Service to the detriment of the interests of their own community."[70]

With the greatest chagrin Dadabhai learnt, after he returned to London, that his friend Kazi Shahabuddin had also joined in the opposition. On July 15, 1887, he wrote to Kazi in anguish:

"How your action has paralysed not only our own efforts, but the hands of our English friends and how keenly I feel this, more so because you have based your action on selfish interests, that because the Muhammadans are backward, therefore, you would not allow the Hindus and all India to go forward.......In the House of Commons I think Mr. Bright has stoutly urged the necessity of an examination in India to put us on an equality with English candidates. To-day when he would and could have urged the same thing with ten times the force, he feels himself staggered, and owing to your opposition he feels puzzled and cannot help us. What a blight you have thrown upon our future and how you have retarded our progress for a long time to come. This discussion will hurt us in a variety of ways. I do not know whether I can hope that before the Commission's work has ended, you will still undo the mischief in some way."[71]

But the sentiment against which Dadabhai thundered was not confined to a few individuals; it was shared by the Muslims in general all over India. The Central Muhammadan Association, Madras, sent a memorial requesting the Government that the recommendations of the Public Service Commission for the abolition of the Statutory Civil Service and for the introduction of a system of competitive examination should not be accepted, for in that case the Hindus would get the full advantage and the "result would be disastrous to the Muslim Community."[71a]

There can be no gainsaying the fact that the Muslim apprehensions were well-founded, that in all human probability every advance in democracy in India would increase the dominance of the Hindus, and an open competitive examination would give preponderance to the Hindus over Muslims in all higher posts under the Government. There is, however, nothing to show that this patent fact was recognized by the Hindus who were too much imbued with nationalistic ideas to take a realistic view of things.

Dadabhai, however, touched the crux of the whole problem when he observed that the attitude of the Muslims was "based on selfish interests, that because the Muhammadans are backward, therefore, they would not allow the Hindus and all India to go forward". In all human probability there would never be a time, at least within measurable distance, when the Muslims would be equally advanced with the Hindus in point of education. If, therefore, the Muslims persisted in their present attitude, nobody could forsee a period, even in distant future, when they would readily join the Hindus in political fight for democracy or nationalism. The Hindu political leaders hoped that a consideration of this dismal prospect would induce the Muslims to give up communal for national interest in the hope that ultimately even the communal interest would be better served by following this course. But it is easy to explain why the Muslims as a body could not or would not follow this advice.

As always happens, a community, as a whole, is guided by the considerations of immediate interest involved rather than those of a remote ideal of which very few have any clear conception. Particularly, as in this case, the idea of an Indian nationality was generally lacking both among Hindus and Muslims.The Muslims could not forget that they were masters of the Hindus not long ago. To be subject to the British was bad enough, but subjection to Hindu domination would be far worse. This mentality may be regarded as ignoble from the higher standpoint of Indian nationality, but it is difficult to say that it is unnatural.

It would have been an act of great sacrifice on the part of the Muslims to join the Hindus in their political demands. But what were the inducements to such a sacrifice? In social and religious matters a deep gulf separated the two. Historical traditions and memories created a wide barrier between them. The name of Shivaji was an inspiration to the Hindus who held Aurangzeb in open contempt. The reverse was the case with the Muslims. The Rājput heroes like Rānā Pratāp were the idols of the Hindus and enemies of the Muslims. The Third Battle of Panipat was the occasion of national mourning for the Hindus but of a great deliverance for the Muslims. Such instances can be easily multiplied.

It may be argued with a great deal of plausibility, that in spite of all this a fusion of Hindus and Muslims into one nation was not an impossible ideal. Even if this be admitted, it must not be forgotten that what was at best merely a possible ideal should not have been mistaken for an actual fact, either already accomplished, or nearing completion. But the most eminent Hindu political leaders committed this fatal mistake. They took for granted what was at best a remote contingency, not to be achieved without great difficulty. They never understood, nor even cared to understand, the real feelings and impulses of the Muslim community. They never appreciated the motives which guided their policy and actions. The result was that they could not realize the patent fact that the Hindus and Muslims were, *as yet,* two different political units. In their new-born zeal for democracy and nationalism the Hindus forgot that a large section of the people, for very good reasons, refused to accept these ideals. They, therefore, could not conceive any possible opposition to them from any quarter, far less brook it when it occurred. In the voluminous political literature of the period one looks in vain for a just assessment of the Muslim point of view on the part of the Hindus. The Hindu leaders made the great mistake of taking Badruddin Tyabji and a few men of his views as the only real representatives of the Muslims. They failed to read the sign of the times and had no patience to listen sympathetically to the grievances of the Muslims, which might not excuse, but could at least satisfactorily explain, their attitude towards the Hindus.

The indifference or apathy of the Muslim masses to all political questions probably contributed largely to the mistaken notion of the Hindus about the Muslim attitude. Confronted by the opposition of educated Muslims, they consoled themselves with the idea that the Muslim masses were not with the latter, and the opposition was after all confined to the educated few. In arguing thus they committed the same mistake as the British rulers did when they ignored the demands of Indian politicians because they represented, in their eyes, a "microscopic minority". But as a prominent Hindu pointed out in reply, "the educated community represented the brain and conscience of the country, and were the legitimate spokesmen of the illiterate masses, the natural custodians of their interests".

The Hindus, however, forgot that what they urged on behalf of the country at large applied equally well to a distinct and strong minority community. They should have foreseen that ultimately the Muslim masses were bound to fall in line with the views of their leaders.

APPENDIX

HINDU-MUSLIM RIOTS

1. Thana (Bombay) Riots (1837)

The Official account runs as follows:—

"There has long been ill-feeling between the Musalmans and the Hindus of Bhiwindi (in Thana District). In April, 1837, the *Muharram* chanced to fall at the same time as the Hindu festival of *Ramnavami*, or Rama's birth day. The Musalmans were determined not to allow the idol of Vithoba, the local representative of Rama, to be carried about the streets during the ten days of *Muharram*. On the 14th April, Vithoba's birthday, when his image ought to have been carried through the town, the Musalmans gathered in front of his temple. The Hindus, fearing violence, gave up their procession and went to their homes. To be revenged on the Musalmans the Banias closed their shops, and the low class Hindus promised to take no part in the *Muharram*. Next day (15th April) the want of supplies irritated the Musalmans, and in the evening they were further enraged by finding that of their seven or eight *Muharram* biers or tabuts, only two could be moved because the usual Hindu bearers refused to touch them and the Mahars would neither play music nor carry torches. According to the Musalman account, as the procession passed an empty house, the tabuts were battered with stones. On this the Musalmans broke into open riot, entered Vithoba's temple. stripped the idol of its jewels, broke some trellis work and images. and handled an old sickly Mahar so roughly that he soon after died. Forty-eight Musalmans were arrested, and twenty-one convicted and sentenced to long terms of imprisonment."[72]

2. Broach Riot (1857)

This had no connection with the Mutiny. In the beginning of May, 1857, the Muhammadans of Broach became angry with one Bezanji Seriadji, a Parsi, notorious for his bad character and supposed to have insulted Islam. On a charge of assault he was convicted. But the Muslims were not satisfied with his lenient sentence. On 15th May, in spite of some police precaution they managed to attack the Parsi quarters, and killed Bezanji and the Parsi high priest. The situation was quickly brought under control and several rioters arrested. Of them two were later hanged and several imprisoned. This was the work of the Bohra community. Before attacking the Parsis a rumour was circulated that a mosque had been defiled.[73]

3. Janjira Riots (1877)

The Official account runs as follows:

"In September, 1877, a series of riots took place between the Hindu and the Musalman subjects of the Nawab of Janjira. According to the rules of the State, Hindu procession and music were forbidden during *Ramzan,* from the 1st to the 12th of *Muharram,* and during two other months. Music was not allowed on Sunday or Thursday nights and during the whole of Fridays. If weddings or great Hindu festivals fell during the forbidden periods, the Hindus were allowed to play music within their houses, unless the house was near a mosque or a Muhammadan's house, in which case music was forbidden.

"In September 1877, as Ganapati holidays fell in the Muhammadan month of *Ramzan,* under previous rules the Hindus were forbidden the use of music. On the 26th of August, just before the beginning of *Ramzan,* under the influence of his Hindu advisers, the Nawab issued an order which, though skilfully worded, in effect withdrew all restrictions on Hindu processions and music, except that music was not to be played in front of mosques. This order was communicated to Mr. Larcom, the Assistant Agent, and as he heard no objections, he supposed that the order had been issued to meet the difficulty of the Ganapati processions happening during the *Ramzan.* He therefore ordered the Magistrates to enforce the new rules. When they came to understand them the Muhammadans took bitter offence at the new rules, and getting no redress from the Nawab, determined to prevent the Hindus from playing music in public. Between the tenth and the sixteenth of September seven disturbances took place. In some cases the Musalmans took the offensive, entering Hindu houses and breaking idols; in other cases the fault lay with the Hindus, who were foolhardy enough to play in front of mosques. The offenders were in most cases fined and forced to apologise. The obnoxious order was withdrawn, and another order, fair to both sides, was prepared by a committee of leading Musalmans and Hindus"[74]

4. Anti-kine-killing Riots in Bihar (1893-4)

During the early part of 1893-4 considerable activity was shown by different associations formed for the protection of kine, known as *Gorakshiṇī sabhā,* in collecting subscriptions and in promoting the anti-kine-killing movement. During April and May 1893, there were several riots occasioned by the forcible rescuing of cattle from Muhammadan butchers, and additional police had to be appointed in seven places in the Gaya District. On the 27th August a very serious riot broke out at Koath in Sahabad District. It began with an attack on the Muhammadan butchers by the Hindus, and ended in a general riot, involving some casualties. In the Saran District a drove of cattle, stopped by the Hindus on the high road between Champaran and Chapra on 31 August, were taken for safety to the police station, but it was attacked by a large mob of Hindus armed with *lathis.* The police opened fire, killing two and injuring many.[75]

5. Calcutta Riots (1897).

Maharaja Sir Jatindra-mohan Tagore obtained by a decree of the court a plot of land at Talla, just outside the northern limit of the city of Calcutta. There was a small hut on the piece of land which the Muhammadans claimed to be a mosque. So when the Tagore's party went to take possession of the land, a large number of lower class Muhammadans gathered with a view to resisting the demolition of the hut. Though they were dispersed by the police, a group of them attacked the Calcutta Water-works pumping station in the neighbourhood. This was the signal for a number of riots, in different parts of Calcutta, by detached parties of Muhammadans during the night of 30 June and on 1 July, in the course of which the police opened fire on several occasions. The total casualties included 11 killed and about 20 wounded among the rioters, and 34 injured among the police. Eighty-seven of the rioters were arrested of whom eighty-one were convicted.[76]

---

1. See pp. 4-5, 12-3.
1a. See pp. 7-10.
2. *The Amrit Bazar Patrika,* 12 August, 1869.
3. Ram Gopal, 35.
4. But cf. Vol. IX, p. 886.
5. B. Majumdar, 393.
6. The name was later changed to Central National Mohammadan Association. The Hindus were eligible for membership but were not entitled to vote on purely Muslim matters. For an account of it cf. *Central Mohammadan Association of Calcutta and the Memorandum Presented to Lord Ripon (1882),* published by the Historical Research Institute, Panjab University, Lahore (1963). It is noteworthy that all the three Muslim Associations were founded in Calcutta. It may be held, therefore, that the Bengal Muslims took up the cause of their communiy before Syed Ahmad, and anticipated, in some respects, the Aligarh Movement *minus* its extreme communal attitude.
7. Ibid.
8. Ibid, 394.
9. Ibid, 395.
10. Blunt-1, p. 27.
11. Ibid, 94.
12. Ibid, 115-6.
12a. Blunt always writes 'Mulvi' for 'Maulvi'.

13. Ibid, 103.
14. Ibid, 103-4.
15. Ibid, 107-9.
16. Ibid, 109-10.
17. Ibid, 111-2.
18. Ibid, 121.
19. B. Majumdar, 399.
20. Ibid, 211 ff.
21. Blunt-I, 163.
22. Ibid, 165.
23. B. C. Pal-I, I. 417.
24. Blunt-I, 112.
25. Ram Gopal, op. cit., 36.
26. *Adam's Report*, 248.
26a. Aga Khan, *India in Transition.*
26b. Unpublished record in CRO, London.
27. See above, IX. 521.
28. W. W. Hunter-I, p. 3.
29. Graham, *Sir Syed Ahmad*, pp. 183-4.
30. *Eminent Mussalmans* (Natesan), p. 32.
31. Rajendra Prasad, *India Divided*, p. 99.
32. Ibid, 100; *Eminent Mussalmans*, 32.
33. Rajendra Prasad, op. cit. 99.
34. *Causes of Indian Revolt*, 54-5.
35. Sachin Sen, p. 42.
36. Coupland-II, Part I, pp. 154-6.
36a. Syed Ahmad Khan, *Akhari Madamin*, pp. 46-50. Quoted in *Sources of Indian Tradition*, pp. 746-7.
37. R. Symonds, *Making of Pakistan*, pp. 30-1.
38. *Muslim League*, p. 4.
39. Masani, *Dadabhai*, pp. 254-5.
40. Rajendra Prasad, op. cit., 103.
41. *Muslim League*, p. 7.
42. Rajendra Prasad, op. cit., 104-5.
43. Asok Mehta, p. 60; Ram Gopal, p. 72.
43a. Ram Gopal, op. cit., p. 73.
43b. Ibid, 75.
43c. P.C. Ghosh, *The Development of the Indian National Congress*, p. 148.
43d. Ram Gopal, op. cit., p. 67.
43e. P.C. Ghosh, op. cit., 148-9.
44. *Hist. Congr.*, I. 67.
45. *A Nation in Making*, 108.
46. Hoyland, *Gokhale*, 160 (quoted in Buch-I, 183).
46a. See p. 309.
46b. Syed Ahmad Khan, *On the Present State of Indian Politics*, pp. 11-12.
47. Noman, p. 40.
47a. P.C. Ghosh, op. cit., 151-2.
48. *Muslim League*, 4
49. *The Aligarh Institute Gazette*, 21 July, 1888, p. 806. Quoted in *Muslim League*, pp. 5-6. Italics mine. Attention may be drawn to the expression 'Mohamedan Nation'.
50. *Muslim League*, pp. 25-6.
51. See p. 296.
52. *A Nation in Making*, 108.
53. *Muslim League*, 25.
54. Asok Mehta, p. 58.
55. Lajpat Rai-II, 404; Rajendra Prasad, op. cit., 87.
56. Seeley, 270.
57. See p. 309.
58. Asok Mehta, 54.
59. G.F. Macmunn and A.C. Lovett. *The Armies of India*, p. 118; also see above p 309.
60. *Modern Review*, 1911, I. 303; Lajpat Rai-II, 400. Colchester, *Ellenborough.*
61. Lajpat Rai-II, 401.
62. See above, IX, 616.
63. *Indian Speeches of Lord Dufferin; Modern Review*, 1911, I. 303.
63a. Noman, 55.

63b. Ambedkar, *Pakistan,* 240-41.
63c. This and the other letters referred to below are copied from the originals in the India Office (now C.R.O.) Library, London.
64. Cumming, *Political India,* p. 110.
65. See above, IX. 514, 519, 521.
66. Cumming, op. cit., 110.
67. Masani—*Dadabhai,* pp. 62-6.
67a. Mody—*Pheroze Shah Mehta,* pp. 81-8.
68. *Statutory Report,* Vol. IV, Part I, pp. 96-7.
69. See pp. 11-3.
69a. For the full enunciation of this view, Cf. B. Majumdar, p. 294.
70. Masani—*Dadabhai,* p. 256.
71. Ibid.
71a. Unpublished Record.
72. *Bombay Gazetteer,* XIII, Part 2, p. 524.
73. Ibid, II. 476.
74. Ibid, XI, 450-1.
75. Buckland, II. 952.
76. Ibid, 1004.

CHAPTER IX (XLVII).

SOCIAL RELATION BETWEEN ENGLISHMEN AND INDIANS

The attitude of a conquering people towards the subject races is bound to be rude and arrogant, at best condescending, in most cases, and the Englishmen in India formed no exception to this rule. The universal nature of this evil and its fundamental causes have thus been described by John Stuart Mill:

"Now, if there be a fact to which all experience testifies, it is that when a country holds another in subjection, the individuals of the ruling people who resort to the foreign country to make their fortune are of all others those who must need to be held under powerful restraint. They are always one of the chief difficulties of the Government. Armed with the prestige and filled with the scornful over-bearingness of the conquering nation, they have the feelings inspired by the sense of absolute power without its sense of responsibility.

"Among a people, like that of India, utmost efforts of the public authorities are not enough for the effectual protection of the weak against the strong: and of all the strong, the European settlers are the strongest. Wherever the demoralizing of the situation is not in a most remarkable degree corrected by the personal character of the individual, they think the people of the country mere dirt under their feet."[1]

Apart from this spirit of arrogance which the Englishmen in India fully displayed like all conquering nations, there were other causes of estrangement between the two. Englishmen despised the Hindus as barbarians, with hardly any trace of culture and civilization, and some even regarded them almost as brutes. Immediately after he set foot on the soil of India as Governor-General, the Marquess of Hastings wrote:

> "The Hindoo appears a being nearly limited to mere animal functions, and even in them indifferent. Their proficiency and skill in the several lines of occupation to which they are restricted, are little more than the dexterity which any animal with similar conformation, but with no higher intellect than a dog, and an elephant, or a monkey, might be supposed capable of

> attaining. It is enough to see this in order to have full conviction that such a people can at no period have been more advanced in civil polity. Retrogradation from an improved condition of society never takes this course. According to the circumstances which have dissolved its government, the fragments of such a community either preserve the traces of effiminate refinement, or the rough fierceness stamped upon them by the convulsions amid which the centre of the fabric perished. Does not this display the true condition of India, and unveil the circumstances through which we have so unexpectedly and so unintentionally obtained empire here? There surely never has been an active and vigorous Hindoo population; nor are any of the bold, though rude, monuments of antiquity (as I think) ascribable to this race."[2]

The above is an extract from the diary of the Marquess dated October 2, 1813, the day on which he reached the Diamond Harbour on his way from England to Calcutta, via. Madras. It refers mainly to Bengal. On June 23, 1814, he writes: "Every day more and more satisfies me that I formed a just estimate of those who inhabit Bengal at least."

Five years after the noble Marquess recorded his impressions of the Bengali Hindus, the eminent British historian Mill echoed his views. He seeks to prove that the abject condition in which the English found the Hindus in the eighteenth century represents their normal condition throughout their history. He ridicules the 'hypothesis of a high state of civilisation' propounded by Sir William Jones in regard to the ancient Hindus and observes: "Their laws and institutions are adapted to the very state of society which those who visit them now behold, such as could neither begin, nor exist, under any other than one of the rudest and weakest states of the human mind." In forming a comparative estimate, Mill declares that the people of Europe, even during the Feudal ages, were greatly superior to the Hindus. Proceeding further he observes: 'In truth the Hindu, like the eunuch, excels in the qualities of a slave'. A few lines further on he remarks: "In the still more important qualities, which constitute what we call the moral character, the Hindu ranks very low." After all this, it would scarcely surprise any one to be told that 'it will not admit of any long dispute, that human nature in India gained, and gained very considerably, by passing from a Hindu to a Mohammadan government.'[3]

But be it said to the credit of Englishmen, that some of them, at any rate, not only did not share such views but even strongly resented them. Sir Thomas Munro correctly diagnosed the situation when he wrote in 1817: "Foreign conquerors have treated the natives with violence, but none has treated them with so much scorn as we; none have stigmatized the whole people as unworthy of trust, as incapable of honesty, and as fit to be employed only where we cannot do without them. It seems not only ungenerous, but impolitic, to debase the character, of a people fallen under our dominion."[4] Another contemporary Englishman, F. J. Shore, also wrote in the same strain.[5]

Even in the twentieth century, when the British imperialism was at its height, liberal-minded Englishmen were not wanting who followed in their footsteps. As the criticism or analysis of the British attitude towards the Indians by an Englishman is less open to suspicion and is likely to carry greater weight, no apology is needed to reproduce a few extracts from the writings of Mr. T. G. P. Spear.

"In Hindustan and Bengal the intercourse between the European and the Mussulman was almost entirely with princes and nobles. ...With the Hindus there is not so much evidence of extensive social intercourse....But the seal of social intercourse is personal friendship, and this, too, had its place in the life of the eighteenth century. But as the century drew to its close, a change in the social atmosphere gradually came about....The attitude of the average Englishman changed from one of disapproval of Hindu 'superstition' and Mussulman 'bigotry'...into one of contempt for an inferior and conquered people. A 'superiority complex' was forming which regarded India not only as a country whose institutions were bad and people corrupted, but one which was by its nature incapable of ever becoming better." "Such an attitude rankles in the mind like a festering sore......" "It found expression in the eighteenth century—more commonly at the end than at the beginning—in the description of all Hindus as effiminate and servile and of Mussulmans as cruel and faithless...." "Europeans", wrote Captain Williamson in 1810 with twenty years' experience of the country, "have little connexion with natives of either religion except for business." Mrs. Graham, visiting Calcutta in 1810 after living in Bombay and Madras, deplored that "the distance kept up between the Europeans and the natives, both here and at Madras, is such that I have not been able to get acquainted with any native family as I did in Bombay...." "Amongst the Europeans the feeling was strong that Indians should always be subordinated to Europeans." "As the new century advanced things grew worse rather than better".[6]

This characteristic trait of the Englishman in India may be traced from the beginning to the end, and was noticed by non-Englishmen.

Syed Ghulam Husain, the author of the *Seir-ul-Mutaqherin,* noted as far back as 1782 that the Englishmen avoided social intercourse with the Indians. Joseph Chailley, a member of the French Chamber of Deputies, who visited India twice, in 1900-1, and again in 1904-5, wrote: "With very rare exceptions, chiefly made by and on behalf of the Parsis, English and Indians have only business relations and do not meet in the ordinary functions of society. There is more, however, than mere abstention from social relations; there is active repugnance and hostility. Englishmen will not join volunteer corps if Indians are admitted thereto. British soldiers will assault, plunder or even kill natives. If they are prosecuted, a European jury is prone to shut its eyes to the evidence; while, if they have to be convicted, European opinion is moved to the point of addressing remonstrances to the Government of India."[7]

This mental attitude was naturally reflected in the conduct of the British officials to the Indians. A classical example of the rude behaviour of English officials towards the Indians is furnished by the humiliation which Raja Rammohan Roy had to suffer in 1809 in the hands of the Collector of Bhagalpur. The details of the incident are recorded in a petition submitted by the Raja to Lord Minto, the Governor-General of India, and throw interesting light on the mental attitude of both Europeans and Indians of high positions. At about 4 o'clock in the afternoon on 1 January, 1809, the Raja was passing in his palanquin through a road in Bhagalpur, a new place where he had arrived on the same morning. Sir Frederick Hamilton, the Collector of the District, was standing among some bricks on the left side of the road, but as the door of the palanquin was shut to prevent dust, the Raja did not see him. The Collector, thinking that he was being slighted by a native, soon began calling out to him to get out of his palanquin, and that "with an epithet of abuse too gross" to be stated in the petition. The servant of the Raja, who was accompanying him on foot, tried to conciliate the irate Collector by explaining that his master had not observed the latter. But, in spite of it, the Collector not only continued the filthy abuse, but overtook the palanquin on horseback and demanded from the Raja 'the form of external respect due to a Collector'. Consequently the Raja, "notwistanding the novelty of the form in which respect was required to be testified", "alighted from his palanquin and saluted Sir Frederick, apologizing to him for the omission" of that act of respect on the ground that he did not see him before. Sir Frederick was not fully satisfied and desired that the Raja must discharge his servant immediately after his (Frederick's) departure from the place of occurrence The Raja made a spirited protest to the Governor-General who issued directions to the Collector for proper behaviour to the

Indians.[8] There the matter ended; but it is worthy of note that the Raja had to submit to the humiliation and also offer apology. Dwaraka-nath Tagore, the grandfather of poet Rabindra-nath, and a very distinguished man of his age, observed in a speech in 1836, that 'twenty years ago the Company treated the Indians as slaves".[9] The arrogance of the Englishmen was further aggravated by the abject submission of the Indians. Referring to this Dwaraka-nath remarks: "They are timid in the extreme, and very reluctant to come forward in asserting their rights. They fear that those who rule them will be displeased and would ruin them by a stroke of the pen." But then he immediately adds that "the fear is not without cause, for numbers of them have suffered for no other cause than displeasing a civil servant, or unintentionally omitting to make a *salam* when they are passing on the road."[10]

Things were gradually worsening in this respect. Referring to the régime of Bentinck, an English writer remarks: "On going to a station no Englishman thought of calling on the notables of the district, as was once done as a matter of course; instead, certificates of respectability were required of the notables before they could be guaranteed a chair when they visited the officer."[11] Sir Henry Strachey, in his report to Parliament, attributes many of the defects in the administration in Bengal to "the immeasurable distance between us and the natives." and adds that "there is scarcely a native in his district who would think of sitting down in the presence of an English gentleman."[12]

Dwaraka-nath Tagore recognized that non-official Englishmen. living in Calcutta, were more sympathetic towards the Indians, and thanks to their attitude and co-operation the Indians living in Calcutta were much better off than those living in *mofussil.*[13] But even in Calcutta "many writers expected every Indian to salute them," and no Indian could drive to the Governor-General's house in a carriage until Bentinck "achieved fame" by permitting Indians to do so.[14]

But the events soon proved that the sympathy of non-official Englishmen towards the Indians was merely skin-deep. The violent agitation set up by them against the so-called "Black Acts" of 1849, referred to above,[14a] demonstrated it beyond doubt. The political effect of the successful agitation of the Europeans on this occasion was the foundation of the British Indian Association in Calcutta. There were many European members in both the Landholders' Society and the Bengal British India Society, but when these were amalgamated into the British Indian Association, not a single European member joined it.

As regards the change in Indian sentiment, we can do no better than quote the views of Bhola-nath Chandra, an eminent contemporary Bengali writer, expressed long after the event: "There can be little room for mutual regard where a few persons are allowed to arrogate superiority, and others have to brook their humiliation in sullen discontent. The standing estrangement has caused a soreness between the two peoples, which has rankled down to the present generation. Worked upon by a heritage of passions that has deadened every feeling for fellowship, no rapprochement since made has ever proceeded from the heart of either race."[15] But the effect of the same agitation on the social relationship was no less serious. It served to estrange the Indian and European communities which had hitherto co-operated in social and political activities. The Europeans now began to show those signs of aloofness from Indians which culminated in almost a complete isolation after the outbreak of 1857. A few concrete facts may be stated to illustrate the change in social relations. Englishmen at first maintained social relations with the Indians. They respected their religious and social customs and even married Indian women. They mixed with the Hindus in convivial parties, smoked *hookah*, chewed betels, and enjoyed the dancing and music of professional native girls. But Englishmen in the thirties referred to "the horrid example of the older generation of Englishmen, with their black wives running about picking up a little rice, while their husbands please them by worshipping the favourite idol". Though changes were fast taking place, traditions of the old days had not died out altogether. Dwaraka-nath Tagore entertained big social parties of Europeans and Indians in his villa at Belgachia near Calcutta, and was not unoften a welcome guest of Lord Auckland at Barrackpur. In a magnificent breakfast held at Lakhnau on Christmas day, 1837, Auckland "sugared and creamed" the tea of the Nawab of Avadh (Oudh) who gave him some 'pillau' and offered buttered toast (rather cold and greasy) to his two sisters. At the end of the breakfast two *hookahs* were brought in so that the Governor-General and the Nawab might smoke together. 'The old Khansamah wisely took care to put no tobacco in the former's *hookah;* but even then Auckland was quite distressed as he could not persuade the inanimate instrument 'to make the right kind of bubbling noise.'[16] This pen picture by one of the two sisters, present on the occasion, reveals a state of things which was soon to become a historic memory.

Lord John Lawrence issued orders restricting admission of Indians to entertainment at Viceregal Lodge. The European officers "assaulted respectable residents of the country because on passing a European in the road they have not dismounted from their horses in token of their inferiority. A Lieutenant-Governor of a province did not consider it unworthy of his dignity to issue general orders regarding the character of the head-dress to be worn by natives in the presence of their official superiors".[17]

The official attitude towards Indian religions also underwent great changes. "The East India Company in early days patronized both the Hindu and Muslim religions. Offices were open on Sunday but closed on Indian holidays. Troops were paraded in honour of Hindu deities. A coconut was solemnly broken at the beginning of each monsoon, and British officials assisted in the management of Hindu religious trusts."[18]

This phase ended early in the nineteenth century. The change was in a large measure due to the missionary activities.[18a] The right of unrestricted entry of Christian missionaries to India was conceded by the Charter of 1813. Henceforth the missionaries formed an important element in society. In general, they were far more sympathetic and well-behaved towards the Indians, and many of them proved to be genuine friends of Indian masses. Reference has been made above to their attempt to protect the cultivators from the oppression of the indigo-planters.[19] The missionaries were pioneers of English education and established schools for both boys and girls. Some of them like Carey and Marshman made valuable contribution to the growth of Bengali literature. For all this the Indians should ever remain grateful to them.

Unfortunately, all these humanitarian acts were part and parcel of their proselytising mission, and the two were indissolubly bound up together. The general dislike of the Hindus towards their religious propaganda has been described and explained by Raja Rammohan Roy in memorable words, quoted above,[20] which are lofty and dignified in tone and have a far wider application than the immediate context in which they were written. The missionaries, in their schools and religious tracts, poured forth venomous abuses against the Hindus, and this considerably estranged the relation between the two communities. In particular, the conversion of Hindus to Christianity, by force or fraud as the Hindus thought, embittered the relations, sometimes almost to a breaking point.

The Hindus felt alarmed at the efforts of the missionaries to educate Indian women with a view to propagating Christianity among them. The teaching of Christian doctrines was made compulsory in the girls' schools especially founded by them, and their contemptuous reference to Hindu gods has been quoted above.[21]

Contemporary Bengali periodicals frequently refer to cases of conversion to Christianity by means of methods which were regarded as highly objectionable, and there was a very strong agitation in the Hindu community against such practices.

In Madras also there was a strong feeling on the subject. The Hindu community sent a memorial against Christian missionaries as well as highly placed English officials (including a Governor) whose activities were supposed to affect adversely the Hindu interests and harm Hindu religion. That such apprehensions were not altogether without foundation is proved by a minute by the Governor (1806) showing the importance of converting the Hindus and Muhammadans into Christians.[21a]

Spear observes: Another contributory factor to this growing racial estrangement was the influence of the evangelical missionaries and chaplains. Their denunciation of them (Hinduism and Islam) was so violent, that they propagated the idea of Indian society as irredeemably corrupt and degraded .... The violence of his (missionary's) denunciations confirmed the Europeans in their belief that few Indians were fit to associate with, that it was a waste of time to mix with them...."[22]

The social exclusiveness of the Englishmen, their arrogance and insolent treatment of Indians, particularly the immunity which they practically enjoyed for their criminal acts, including even murder of Indians, were sources of grave discontent. There are numerous instances of all this in contemporary periodical literature and judicial records. Before referring to these it is worth while reproducing the views of Englishmen themselves who spoke from their personal knowledge.

Routledge refers to Englishmen going through crowds of people elbowing their way as through a herd of cattle, and the people, as a rule, falling back on all hands. He further observes that "a man of the highest position in a District may be made to feel and feel sharply that he is subordinate to some young officer fresh from England and ignorant of all life save in school."[23]

The rudeness and brutal arrogance of the Britishers were more often manifested in striking Indians, especially domestic servants. Sir Henry Cotton refers to the "cult of Nicholson" and the many stories he heard of "the exploits of these heroes of India with stick and whip!" Then he proceeds: "I am bound to say that this pernicious practice of striking natives, and especially domestic servants, prevailed as a common and general habit during the whole of my residence in India.... I remember once when I was walking through the streets of an up-country city with a high official, and a few miserable petitioners blocked the way by throwing themselves prostrate before him and endeavouring to clasp his feet, he struck them right and left with his stick, and thought nothing of it. On another occasion when I had ventured to remonstrate with a distinguished officer for striking a lazy or careless gardener, I was met with the reply that there was no harm in it, and that everybody did it. When I retorted that I did not, I was told that I was the only man he had ever met who could say that. These are not reminiscences on which I love to dwell, but they serve to illustrate how subtle and unconscious is the poison of demoralisation in Anglo-Indian life."[24]

A few more concrete instances are given by Sir Henry Cotton:

A subaltern gets into a railway carriage, where to his disgust he finds a couple of Hindu gentlemen. He quietly waits till the train is in motion, and then, as he expresses it, 'fires them out of the door.' A petty raja going in a first class compartment "had been boxed up with a couple of sahibs, muddy from snipe shooting, who made him shampoo them all the way". This story is corroborated by Sir David Barr, the late Resident at Hyderabad. Again Cotton writes: "It is but too common an outrage to assault respectable residents of the country because when passing on the road they have not dismounted from their horses in token of their inferiority. I have known a case in which an unfortunate old man died from the effects of blows so received."[25]

As mentioned above, Raja Rammohan Roy was himself a victim of such outrage. But he had the courage to protest to the Governor-General who issued directives to remedy this evil. But admonishments, even of the highest authority, had no effect, and what was exceptional at first soon became a regular feature of Englishman's life. Bankim-chandra Chatterji, the famous Bengali *littérateur* and a Deputy Magistrate, was similarly insulted, but he extorted an apology from the offending Colonel.[26]

The cases of assault of Indians by Europeans not only continued throughout the period under review, but seem to have been on the increase as years rolled by. This is proved by the official records of the Government of India. More than 200 cases were reported in 1900 as well as in 1901. More than 75 out of these were brutal attacks on *punkha coolies* by European soldiers, and the others included outraging the modesty of women and assaults on coolies by European managers of tea-gardens.

Even a cursory glance at the Index of the Home Department Files would show the nature and extent of these crimes. A somewhat novel way of insulting an Indian is mentioned in a case where the Police Superintendent placed shoes on the head of a Brahmin constable.

The Indian newspapers were full of reports of such crimes. Many Bengali newspapers gave harrowing details of the death of the labourers in tea-gardens from the effect of kicks administered by Europeans. These were very seldom reported to the authorities. But even when brought to trial, the European planter almost always got scot-free, because the medical report put down the death of the unfortunate coolie to an enlarged spleen. Cartoons in Bengali papers showed the pathetic character of such mock trials. The trying Magistrate having acquitted the Manager on the evidence of the European Doctor, the three left the court together with smiling face and cigars in their mouths, while the dead body of the *coolie* was lying in a corner with his widow and children crying by its side.

The Indian papers also refer to the ludicrously light punishment awarded to European offenders:—a planter punished to nine months' simple imprisonment for killing his maid-servant; a European soldier sentenced to one year's rigorous imprisonment for stoning an Indian soldier to death; a veterinary Superintendent fined Rs. 100 for having thrown a native boy into fire and thus causing his death, etc. All these happened at the beginning of the twentieth century.

The *Barāhanagar Patrikā Samāchāṛ* reports a case that Inspector Buckley, of the Barrackpur Station, entered the shop of an old man and dealt him a blow which knocked him down. On his rising and attempting to escape he was again knocked down. The Inspector also turned upon the people who had gathered on the spot by this time. The paper comments: "Acts of oppression like this have become, as it were, an ornament of the police." The same paper reports that Inspector Smith of Dumdum Station tore off the beard of a carter for refusing him the use of a cart which had already been hired to another.[27]

In 1877 Mr. Digby examined a number of Indian papers covering a consecutive period of a few weeks to note the tendencies they evinced and the characteristics they displayed. He noted that one of the prevalent ideas was that "Europeans ill-treated and are discourteous to the natives".[28]

W. S. Blunt, who travelled widely in India in 1883, has quoted many instances, from his personal knowledge, of the racial arrogance of the Englishmen displayed towards the most eminent Indians. Raja Amir Hasan of Lakhnau told him that 'he does not go into English society, because he dislikes being disrespectfully treated.'[29] Blunt notes with surprise that "no hotel-keeper in India dares receive a native guest through fear of losing his custom." When at Bombay, he met Ali Rogay, the leading Muhammadan of the city who had travelled in Europe, dressed in European dress. "Yet, happening one day to ask him to dine with me at my hotel, it was explained to me that this could not be, at least not in the public room, 'lest the English guests should take offence and leave the house."[29a]

A few extracts may be quoted from Blunt's book: "In Bengal and Northern India things are still worse, and I think it is not too much to say that no native gentleman, whatever his rank, age, or character may be, can visit a place of public resort frequented by Englishmen, especially if he be in native dress, without a certain risk of insult and rough treatment. Railway travelling is notoriously dangerous for them in this respect, and nearly all my native acquaintances had tales to tell of abuse from English fellow-passengers, and of having been turned out of their places by the guards to accommodate these, and now and then of having been personally ill-treated and knocked about."[29b]

"A painful incident of this liability to insult occurred last winter in my presence, which, as ocular evidence is always best, I will relate. I had been staying at Patna with the principal Mohammedan nobleman of the city, the Nawab Villayet Ali Khan, a man of somewhat advanced age, and of deservedly high repute, not only with his fellow-citizens, but with our Government, who had made him a Companion of the Star of India for his services. On my departure by the morning train on the 7th January last, he and some thirty more of the leading inhabitants of Patna accompanied me to the station, and after I had entered the railway carriage, remained standing on the platform, as orderly and respectable a group of citizens as need be seen. There was neither obstruction, nor noise, nor crowding. But the presence of 'natives' on the platform became suddenly distasteful to an English passenger in the adjoining compartment. Thrusting his head out of window he began to abuse them and bid them be off, and when they did not move struck at them with his stick, and threatened the old Nawab especially with it if he came within his reach. I shall never forget the astonishment of the man when I interfered, or his indignation at my venturing to call him to account. It was his affair, not mine. Who was I that I should interpose myself between an Englishman and his natural right? Nor was it till, with great difficulty, I had procured the aid of the police, that he seemed to consider himself other than the aggrieved person....

"Moreover, it was evident to me that it was no unusual occurrence. The railway officials and the police treated it as a matter of small importance, did their best to screen the offender, and declared themselves incompetent to do more than register my complaint. On the other hand, the Nawab and his friends confessed with shame that, though they were insulted, they were not surprised. It had happened to all of them too often before for them even to feel any special anger."

"We certainly feel insulted", writes one of them to me a day or two later, "but are powerless to take any action on it. We are used to such treatment from almost every Anglo-Indian."

"We account for his conduct," says another, "by supposing that he thought us (the natives) to be nothing less than brutes and wild creatures"; while a third remarks: "From this you will see how our ruling race treats us with scorn and contempt. Had we been in English dress, then we would not, perhaps, have been so much hated." "I beg to assure you," writes a fourth, "that the incident was not (an only) one of its kind, but such treatment is becoming general. The alarm and dread with which the Anglo-Indians are regarded cannot be described. Alas! we are hated for no other reason but because we have a dark colour; because we put on a national dress; and because we are a conquered race."

"Allow me to say that it will be difficult for England to hold India long if such a state of feeling is allowed to progress without any check."[30] Blunt refers to a mass of letters of this kind.

"Mr. Mandlik, the Hindu Government pleader, holds the highest position of any native's at the Bombay bar. I told him the Patna story. He told me he had often been insulted himself; on one occasion turned out of a railway carriage neck and crop between Benaras and Allahabad. Every native in Bombay had been subjected to such incidents, and he mentioned the instance of the Chief Translator to the Government, promising to furnish me with proofs."[31]

This attitude of Europeans towards Indians was due to a sense of racial superiority—a "cherished conviction which was shared by every Englishman in India, from the highest to the lowest, that he belongs to a race whom God has destined to govern and subdue."[32]

Reference may be made in this connection to Sir John Lawrence's famous challenge, "Will you be governed by the pen or by the sword? Choose!" As Garratt observes, it was intelligible in its times and context. "But only an insensitive arrogance could have selected it to perpetuate on his statue in a great city (Lahore)."[33]

John Nicholson was called, not inaptly, by his brother officers, "the autocrat of all the Russias." One day, while riding through a village, he observed that the Mulla of a mosque, "instead of salaaming to him, looked at him with a gesture of contempt or hatred. When he got home he sent his orderly to fetch the Moulla, and then and there shaved off his beard!"[34] On another occasion he sent the following laconic note to John Lawrence: "Sir,—I have the honour to inform you that I have just shot a man dead who came to kill me. Your obedient servant, John Nicholson."[35]

While the social exclusiveness hurt the feelings of a comparatively few Indians of upper strata, the spirit of the rank and file was embittered by the gratuitous insult, not unoften accompanied by bodily assault, which every Tom, Dick and Harry could, and often did, inflict with impunity upon the most respectable Indians, not to speak of coolies, servants or other lower classes. Occasionally, though very rarely, the authorities took, or promised to take some steps against it, but this irritating evil showed no tendency to decline.

It was customary to find Europeans, and particularly Englishmen, insulting and humiliating Indians in every walk of life. The evidence in this respect is overwhelming. The difficulty, if any, is of selection from numerous cases of various descriptions bearing on the subject. The statement of Chailley has been quoted above. An American clergyman, Dr. C. C. Hall, who toured widely in India, said in 1908, "I have seen Indians of the highest intelligence and character, esteemed personal friends of mine, treated in India with positive discourtesy by Englishmen. These same Englishmen would have cut off their right hands before they would have treated a European so; but they will go out of their way to insult an Indian."[36]

Mr. G. F. Abbott writes: "I have seen youngmen (young government officials in India) who have sprung from London suburbs, treating in public aged Indian noblemen in a manner which a gentleman would not have adopted toward his valet. In any other country these things would have begotten sedition long ago. In India they beget a bitterness which is none the less harmful because it is rarely expressed in action."[37]

Several factors contrived to widen still further the cleavage between the Englishmen and the Indians in the second half of the nineteenth century. The first was the horrors of 1857-8. The cruelties perpetrated by both sides were terrible enough,[38] but were exaggerated by all sorts of wild stories. To the horrid details of Kanpur massacre and woes and miseries actually suffered by individual Englishmen were added fantastic tales of outraging the modesty of white women and other indignities suffered by them. On the other side were stories of wholesale rapine and massacre of Indians on a wide scale, not only perpetrated in course of military campaigns during the progress of the outbreak, but also as deliberate measures of revenge after its suppression. The memories of these haunted the minds of both Indians and Englishmen for a long time and hampered the growth of sincere cordiality and mutual goodwill between the two.

Russell, the Correspondent of *The Times* in India during the Mutiny, writes in his Diary: "The Mutinies have produced too much hatred and ill feeling between the two races to render any mere change of the rulers a remedy for the evils which affect India.... Many years must elapse ere the evil passions excited by these disturbances expire."

The Mutiny also fostered a general attitude of indifference, sometimes bordering on cruelty, towards the Indian soldiers on the part of their officers. This is well illustrated by the Whipping Act on which Sir Henry Cotton observes as follows:

"The Indian Whipping Act was passed in 1864 and is one of the disastrous consequences of post-Mutiny legislation. It is still in force, though I am thankful to say it has lately been modified, and some of its worst provisions have been repealed. The number of judicial floggings which used to be inflicted in India is appalling; in 1878 it amounted to 75,223. That was a record, but even up to recent times it has always been excessive; in 1900 it was 45,054 and has rarely been below 20,000 in any year."[39]

C. T. Garratt observes: "The English have never attempted to remove the irritation caused by their behaviour after the Mutiny, and from that time we must date the long and bitter estrangement between the two races. Born of hatred and fear it was nourished on a series of unfortunate incidents, most of which were the direct result of the new spirit which the Mutiny encouraged amongst Europeans."[40]

The effect of the Mutiny on Englishmen at home is thus described by Garratt:

"Countless middle-class Englishmen learnt to look upon Indians as the creatures, half gorilla, half negro, who appeared in the contemporary *Punch* cartoons. They were usually depicted standing over a murdered woman but cowering before an avenging Britannia who is praying to the God of Battles to 'steel our soldiers' hearts'. For another generation their children learnt of India from the same source. The young men who went out East during and after the Mutiny left a country where 'every one chuckled to hear how General Neill had forced high Brahmins to sweep up the blood of the Europeans murdered at Cawnpore, and then strung them in a row, without giving them the time requisite for the rites of purification'."[41]

It is easy to imagine that the feeling would be far more intense among Englishmen in India. Garratt observes that the Englishmen found, on coming to India, that the spirit of hatred which they brought with them "was shared by the entire mass of our countrymen. Invectives against the treacherous blood-thirsty Mussulmans, ironical sneers about the 'mild Hindoo', were nuts alike to the civilian and the planter. The latter rejoiced to hear the world acknowledge that his estimate of the native had been correct throughout."[42]

As a matter of fact, Garratt is not far from right when he states that the Englishmen in India evolved certain definite anti-Indian ideas. One of these was that the only thing an oriental understood was fear. Another was that in view of the many lives and many millions which were lost to conquer India, the Englishmen deserved some more substantial recompense than the mere privilege of governing India. But by far the most important principle that these Anglo-Indians adhered to as an axiom was that the life of one European was worth those of many Indians; the European's life was sacrosanct and the Indian's was of no consequence.[43]

Lapse of time might have helped to improve the relations between the two communities. Unfortunately, several other factors were at work which stood in the way of such reconciliation and contributed to the growth of social aloofness between the two communities.

The improvement of communication between India and England, first by the introduction of steamship, and then by the opening of Suez Canal, introduced a great change in the attitude of Englishmen towards the Indians. India ceased to be looked upon as an adopted home by the Englishmen as they could now bring their wives with them and more frequently visit their own homes. This altered in a marked degree the relationship between the two races, increasing bitterness, hostility and fear. The presence of a much larger number of English women added very greatly indeed to a new racial tension. Wilfrid Blunt, writing in 1909, observes: "The English woman in India during the last thirty years has been the cause of half the bitter feelings there between race and race....it is her constantly increasing influence now that widens the gulf of ill-feeling and makes amalgamation daily more impossible."[44]

All these had the effect of considerably lessening "the free intercourse between Indians and Englishmen of bygone days and led on to what has been called in India the 'Club' life. This took more and more an exclusive turn, and a caste barrier was raised against the admission of any Indian into this whole area of an Englishman's existence in the country."[45]

Wilfrid Blunt suggests another reason for the change. Comparing older times with his own days (1883) he remarks, "that the men who came out to India as Government servants were, many of them, taken from a comparatively low rank in life, and that, being unused to refined society, or to being treated with much consideration at home, they lost their heads when they found themselves in India in a position of power."[46]

Wilfrid Blunt, who came to India in 1883, and was singularly observant in these matters, noticed the rapidity of the change which had already become established when he arrived in India.

"The account given me by the oldest and best informed of my native acquaintances of the gradual estrangement which has come about within their recollection between themselves and the English in India, is most instructive. In those days the general feeling of the natives towards the English civilian was one of respect and even of affection... He took pains to know the people; and in fact he knew them well. He was readily accessible. He lived to a great extent among the people, and according to the customs of the people. He did not disdain to make friends with those of the better class, and occasionally he married among them.... The Englishmen of that day looked upon India not unfrequently as his second home....The Anglo-Indian official of the Company's days loved India in a way no Queen's official dreams of doing now."[47]

After this, he tries in his own way to explain the reason. It was, he says, because the civilian, under the Crown, looked much more to England than to India. His wife was with him, but she continually went backwards and forward: his young children were obliged to stay in England; and for these two reasons his heart remained where his real home was. His career became Europe-centred. Those who before had all their chief interests in India had changed their outlook. They talked about India as "this wretched country" and in this way became, what they often called themselves, "birds of passage". No one could wholly blame them, but it was necessary to blame the system which led to such unfortunate results. "Lastly," he adds, "the Mutiny itself, with the bitter memories it left behind, put an end to the contracting by Englishmen of native habits and native ties."

Professor T.G.P. Spear of Cambridge also emphasizes the role of English women: "With the advent of women (from England) in large numbers a new standard was introduced, one set of customs and traditions died out and another equally rigid took its place."[48] "Every youth, who is able to maintain a wife, marries. The conjugal pair become a bundle of English prejudices and hate the country, the natives and everything belonging to them.... The 'odious blacks', 'the nasty heathen wretches', 'the filthy creatures' are the shrill echoes of the 'black brutes', the 'black vermin' of the husband. The children catch up this strain."[49]

The conservative nature of women and their ignorance of India made the English ladies less tolerant of the Indian habits and manners than Englishmen, and they set the standard in this respect in the English society in general. Blunt refers to one Lady S. who "complained of the shabby way the Anglo-Indian officials were treated by Government, and thought it hard India should not be governed entirely for their benefit. They all hated India so much that they ought to be handsomely treated for being obliged to live there."[50]

The bitter feelings created between Indians and Englishmen by the incidents of the Mutiny thus went on increasing, and the Englishmen soon formed an exclusive 'caste' as it were, to whom all the Indians were 'untouchable'. The following observations of two English writers clearly depict this and other evil effects of the Mutiny.

"The racial cleavage", write Thompson and Garratt, "became more marked, though the extent of the difference before and after the Mutiny has sometimes been exaggerated. It must be confessed that the growing number of English women who began to settle down in India with their husbands increased the tendency of the white population to form not only a caste but also a group of trade unions, and the recent vivid memories of 1857 inevitably encouraged a belief that these sacrifices merited 'some more substantial recompense than the privilege of governing India in a spirit of wisdom and unselfishness... The rougher type of Englishman interpreted this prevalent feeling by classing all Indians into one opprobrious category, by a disregard for authority, and by a rudeness of bearing which was to be the cause of continual and growing friction during the next half century."[51]

The following observations of Sir Henry Cotton support the same view:

"Ten years had elapsed since the Mutiny, but the Mutiny was, in the early days of my service, a living memory in the minds of all. That memory was not a benign influence on the future career of the young Civilian. When I first arrived in the country, it was duly enjoined on me as a matter of vital importance that I should insist on all the outward and visible signs of deference and respect which

Orientals with a leaning to sycophancy, resulting from generations of subjection and foreign rule, are only too willing to accord. Although I was a very *chota* (small) sahib, and posted only to the humble office of Assistant to the Magistrate and Collector of a district, I was early taught that, though I might be but a fly on the wheel of the official hierarchy, I was, in the eyes of the people among whom I lived, a representative of the Government and entitled as such to rights and privileges on no account to be foregone.

"Such was the atmosphere in which we lived; we were directly encouraged to assume an attitude of a patronising and superior character, which was obviously inimical to the best influences which should be exercised in the service of the state. The old Haileybury tone still pervaded the Civil Service, and the new class of competitioners to which I belonged and who had their spurs to win were easily attracted into the prevailing current. Nor was there any deterrent from the Indian side; nothing could exceed the obsequious and cringing demeanour of the old class of Indians, especially those about the Law Courts, with whom mostly we were brought into immediate contact. It was, in fact, a demoralising environment into which we were thrown, and I am not ashamed to say that I succumbed to it."[52]

The demoralising environment, to which Cotton refers, was a legacy of the past. It was noted long ago by Dwaraka-nath Tagore, and he also traced its origin to the haughty and arrogant attitude of the English officials. The evils were accentuated after the Mutiny, and the English officials became more overbearing in their behaviour towards the Indians. Apart from the social reasons noted above, there were several other factors at work. In the first place, the new method of recruitment by competitive examination put a premium on intellectual efficiency alone and effectively shut off from Indian Service the members of those high social ranks whose birth and breeding made them, generally speaking, more urbane and gentle. Secondly, as the rights and privileges of the officials were now directly guaranteed by the British Government rather than a trading company, and the control of the Crown was necessarily more nominal than real, they arrogated to themselves a higher authority and greater power without any corresponding responsibility or accountability to any superior body. Each covenanted civil servant naturally tended to become a dictator in his own sphere.

Thirdly, the high intellectual ability shown by the English-educated Indians made them an object of dislike to the English officials. These Indians proved themselves equal to the English officials in intellectual eminence and attainments in all spheres of public activity, and this offended their vanity of 'race superiority'—a delicate sensibility or sentiment deliberately fostered by the English officialdom in India. Sir Henry Cotton, who could speak from personal experience, describes it as follows:

"This abhorrence of equality rankles in the mind of all Anglo-Indians, and especially of officials. It is the peculiarity of residence in the East to develop sentiments of intolerance and race superiority. Nearly all young men, on their first arrival in India, are animated by kindly feelings towards the natives of the country. Their generous instincts recoil from the outward manifestations of dislike evinced by the older residents, and it is rare to hear them degenerate to harsh expression, until after they have become demoralized by bad example and the false position in which they are placed. Degeneration, however, soon sets in and few escape it."[53]

Chailley observes: "The British official, while benevolent and sympathetic towards the poor, tends to be stiff and patronising towards the well-to-do.... I was told by a Brahman member of the Viceroy's Legislative Council: 'The Indian Civilian does not wish us to rise. When we learn his language, understand his ideas, and attain his intellectual level, he regards this not as a homage which he should welcome, but as an encroachment to be resented. We used to esteem them for their character, and we flattered ourselves that they would welcome in us just and independent men, but they only want baseness and servility, and thier favours go out to flatterers and time-servers.'"[54]

The social exclusiveness of the Anglo-Indians, the beginnings of which have been described in an earlier chapter,[54a] grew apace in the course of time. This was more and more resented by the growing number of Indians who had visited England. They had mixed freely on a footing of equality with Englishmen there, but found themselves treated in their own country like *pariahs* by the Englishmen, who refused them admittance into their family or club. Indians who were members of the best clubs in London, could not, on their return home, even call on their English friends at the Yacht Club in Bombay. Whatever excuses might be offered to justify this conduct, to the Indians it was nothing but a galling and humiliating racial discrimination which sometimes did more to antagonise them against the British rule than even political disabilities.

The English officials, recruited by competitive examinations, were very capable men, and maintained a high level of efficiency and integrity. They were honest, hard-working and conscientious, and possessed a high sense of duty as they understood it. But much of the good effects of all this was marred by their arrogant and insolent behaviour towards the Indians, specially of the Western-educated type. In this caste-ridden country they formed a new caste. Politically a *Kshatriya* oligarchy, and socially a *Brāhmana* caste, they assumed the powers and pretentions of both, and looked upon all the Indians as *Śūdras*. How closely the position of the Indians resembled the abject condition of the *Śūdras* may be illustrated by two incidents mentioned by Blunt. He relates how a leading Indian had said to him, after receiving a cruel injury on the railway platform: "We feel insulted at such things, but we are not surprised."[55] This reveals the whole inner world of humiliation and indignation in which the 'natives' lived. Again, in his diary, Blunt writes: "It is painful to see, what terror he (i.e. Sir Alfred Lyall) inspires in the 'natives'. Ferid-ed-din, in spite of his boldness, was struck speechless in his presence, and stood before him barefooted. I told Ferid-ed-din to put his shoes on, but Lyall said he had better stay as he was".[56]

Evidently, Blunt was unaware of the "shoe question" which caused a serious headache to the British officials for many years. In accordance with the old Muslim practice, the Indians had to appear before the British officials without shoes. This custom or etiquette, however, ceased to have any meaning when chairs were used instead of carpets in official functions, and it became a positive nuisance when Indians began to use shoes of European fashion. A practice therefore grew up in the Presidency towns and other large stations whereby natives wearing boots and shoes of European fashion were permitted to appear on all official and semi-official functions. But the same natives who could thus meet the Viceroy with shoes on were denied the privilege before a petty British official in a district. This created an anomalous situation; but prestige dies hard. So, after a great deal of discussion, and after "consulting all the principal officers in the country, civil and political," the Government of India went to the length of passing an official resolution in 1868 to the effect that native gentlemen who wore boots and shoes of European fashion' could appear "thus habited" before Government officials at Durbar and on all official or semi-official occasions, but that those who wore shoes of Indian fashion must take them off within the customary limits.[57]

But the Indians smarted under something far worse than gratuitous insult and humiliation at the hands of the Englishmen. As Garratt very properly observed, one potent factor of hatred and estrangement between the Indians and Englishmen was "the long succession of murders and brutalities perpetrated by Englishmen which either went unpunished or for which, at the demand of the whole European community, only a small penalty was exacted."[58] The same thing is testified to by Sir Theodore Morrison: "It is an ugly fact", says he, "which it is no use to disguise that the murder of natives by Englishmen is no infrequent occurrence. In one issue of the *Amrita Bazar Patrika* of this month (August 11, 1898) three contemporary cases are dealt with, in none of which have the prisoners paid the full legal penalty for murder...Juries in European cases are empannelled from towns; this is the very class in which the arrogance of a conquering race is most offensively strong, and their moral sense does not endorse the legal theory that an Englishman should atone with his life for killing a nigger."[59] Three artillery men, according to Morrison, were found guilty of killing one Dr. Suresh Chandra in a brutal manner; but they were sentenced only to seven years' rigorous imprisonment. A military officer commenting on this judicial sentence remarked "that in any other part of the world but India, the three artillery men would have been hanged."[59a] It may be added that the Europeans received a far better treatment in jail than an Indian prisoner belonging to the highest class in society.

The judicial records of the period under review are full of such cases, too numerous to refer in detail. Here, again, we shall begin with instances vouched for by eminent Englishmen.

Thus Sir Henry Cotton writes:

"I place on record here the circumstances of a criminal trial which occurred in 1874, because while it created the highest degree of local excitement in Calcutta, it is also *typical of similar cases which inevitably recur from time to time,* in which the elements of race antagonism are vigorously reflected and the most dangerous passions are roused. Gerald Meares was a stalwart young planter whom I knew very well, as his factory was in the Chooadanga Subdivision. For some reason or other he had mercilessly thrashed the Government postman who was bringing his letters. The scene of the offence was across the border in the Jessore District, and Meares, after a careful trial by the Magistrate of Jessore, was convicted and sentenced to two months' imprisonment. The usual result followed: no stone was left unturned by Anglo-Indian agitation to obtain a reversal of the sentence. The whole volume of English opinion found expression in denouncing the verdict; Calcutta society talked of little else, the Anglo-Indian newspapers added fuel to the flames, public subscriptions were raised to pay the expenses of an appeal, and influentially signed memorials were addressed to the Government praying for Meares's release. The High Court appeal was heard by Justices Kemp and Morris, both civilian Judges, and the verdict of the Magistrate was upheld. The memorial to Government was rejected, and so the case ended. But in the meantime great harm had been done; all the flood-gates of passion and prejudice had been let loose, and a corresponding feeling of resentment and anger had been excited among the members of the Indian community."[60]

Still more interesting and instructive is the "Fuller case" which occurred in 1876, about which Cotton wrote as follows:

"The facts of the case are typical *of a hundred similar cases before and since.* One Sunday morning Mr. Fuller, an English pleader at Agra, was about to drive to church with his family. When the carriage was brought to the door the groom failed to be in attendance, but made his appearance when sent for. For this fault Mr. Fuller struck the groom with his open hand on the head and face and pulled him by the hair so as to cause him to fall down. Mr. Fuller and his family drove on to church; the groom got up, went into an adjoining compound, and there died almost immediately. The medical evidence was to the effect that the man had died from rupture of the spleen, which very slight violence would be sufficient to cause in consequence of the morbid enlargement of the organ. The Joint Magistrate of the Station found Mr. Fuller guilty of 'voluntarily causing what distinctly amounts to hurt'. and sentenced him to pay a fine of Rs. 30/- (or £ 2) which was to be paid over as compensation to the widow of the deceased.

"At the request of the Local Government, the High Court of Allahabad expressed an opinion on the case, which was to the effect that the sentence, though perhaps lighter than the High Court would have been disposed to inflict under the circumstances, was not specially open to objection. It was then that Lord Lytton rose in his wrath:

'The Governor-General in Council cannot but regret that the High Court should have considered that its duties and responsibilities in this matter were adequately fulfilled by the expression of such an opinion. He also regrets that the Local Government should have made no inquiry, until directed to do so by the Government of India, into the circumstances of a case so injurious to the honour of British rule and so damaging to the reputation of British justice in this country.

'The class of misconduct out of which this crime has arisen is believed to be dying out; but the Governor-General in Council would take this opportunity of expressing his abhorrence of the practice, instances of which occasionally come to light, of European masters treating their native servants in a manner in which they would not treat men of their own race. This practice is all the more cowardly because those who are least able to retaliate injury or insult have the strongest claim upon the forbearance and protection of their employers. But, bad as it is from every point of view, it is made worse by the fact, known to all residents in India, that Asiatics are subject to internal disease which often renders fatal to life even a slight external shock. The Governor-General in Council considers that the habit of resorting to blows on every trifling provocation should be visited by adequate legal penalties, and that those who indulge in it should reflect that they may be put in jeopardy for a serious crime.'

"The whole of this letter, which was addressed to the Government of the North-Western, now called the United, Provinces, was a scathing condemnation of what had taken place. Its publication evoked, as was to have been expected, *a storm of Anglo-Indian and official indignation;* while in the Indian Press there was, of course, a chorus of approbation."[61]

Blunt also refers to a case which is typical of many others. "I may here note that I heard from Akbar Huseyn of a case in which liberties had been taken by an English official with a Hindu woman, whose husband's relations, finding her 'no longer of any use to them,' killed her and laid her outside his tent. The case was taken up, and though there was no kind of doubt as to the facts, those who brought it forward were proceeded against by the Government as having brought a malicious charge, and were sentenced to a fine of one thousand rupees each, and three months' imprisonment. My informant added : 'They will never allow a charge to be substantiated against an official for fear of injuring the British character."[62]

One of the worst cases on record in this category is what is known as the 'Cowan Case'. It arose out of the Kuka rebellion to which detailed reference has been made above.[63] But as the punishment meted out to the rebels illustrates the callousness, cruelty and utter lack of a sense of justice on the part of the British officials, it deserves a separate treatment. Here, again, we may reproduce the account given by Sir Henry Cotton. After narrating briefly the circumstances of the revolt and the surrender of 68 prisoners, Cotton proceeds:

"On the 16th of January Mr. Cowan, who was then Deputy Commissioner of the adjoining British District of Loodhiana, ordered the prisoners to be sent into Kotla, where he himself arrived during the day. That evening he wrote to his official superior, the Commissioner, a letter reporting that tranquillity had been completely restored, and adding: 'The entire gang has thus been nearly destroyed. I purpose blowing away from guns or hanging the prisoners to-morrow morning at day-break.' About noon of the following day (the 17th) he received a note from Mr. Forsyth, the Commissioner, desiring him to keep the prisoners at Sherpore till a guard could be sent from Loodhiana. This note he says he put in his pocket 'and thought no more about it.' It was not until 4 p.m. on the afternoon of the 17th that the captured Kukas were marched into Kotla, and then and there, without delay or the semblance of a trial, Mr. Cowan caused forty-nine of them to be blown away from guns. Close on 7 p.m. when the last batch of six men had been lashed to the guns, there came an official order from Mr. Forsyth to send the prisoners to him for trial. In his explanation to Government, Mr. Cowan wrote of that order: 'After reading Mr. Forsyth's letter, I handed it to Colonel Perkins with the remark that it would be impossible to stay the execution of the men already tied to the guns; that such a proceeding would have the worst effect on the people around us'; and so the last six rebels were blown away as had been the forty-three others before them. One man, who would have made the fiftieth, broke from the guard, rushed at Mr. Cowan and caught him by the beard, but was promptly cut down by the sabres of the native officers who were in attendance.

"Such was Mr. Cowan's share in this transaction. The Commissioner, Mr. Forsyth, had repeatedly enjoined on him to proceed with legal formalities, and on the 17th he telegraphed to the Government: 'I am on the spot, and can dispose of the cases according to form and without delay. Exceptional action not necessary and would increase excitement better allayed.' On the 18th, however, having been informed by Mr. Cowan of the ghastly tragedy which had been enacted, he wrote to him in the following terms: 'My dear Cowan, I fully approve and confirm all you have done. You have acted admirably. I am coming out.' He did come out, and sanctioned within the terms of the law the execution of the sixteen remaining prisoners. They were hanged.

"The Government of India recorded an elaborate Resolution on these proceedings. It was understood to have been drafted by Mr. (afterwards Justice) Fitzjames Stephen, whose tenure of the Legal Membership of Council was then drawing to a close. 'His Excellency in Council is under the painful necessity of affirming that the course followed by Mr. Cowan was illegal, that it was not palliated by any public necessity, and that it was characterised by incidents which give it a complexion of barbarity.' And so His Excellency was compelled 'with deep regret' to direct that 'Mr. Cowan be removed from the Service.' As for Mr. Forsyth, he was severely censured and transferred to another province in a corresponding office with the same emoluments. He subsequently became Sir Douglas Forsyth, having been decorated for service beyond the frontier at Yarkand.

"The circumstances of this case and of the orders passed divided public opinion in India into two camps, in much the same way as Governor Eyre's case had shortly before convulsed public opinion in England. *The sympathy of officials generally and of the Anglo-Indian Press was with Messrs. Cowan and Forsyth.*

"The Indian Press at this time exercised but a feeble influence, but it raised its voice, such as it was, in horror of what had occurred. For my part, I can recall nothing during my service in India more revolting and shocking than these executions, and there were many who thought, as I did and still think, that the final orders of the Government of India were lamentably inadequate. The Viceroy of the time was Lord Napier and Ettrick, who was temporarily in charge between the death of Lord Mayo and the arrival of Lord Northbrook on the 3rd of May."[64]

Reference has been made above, in the Fuller case, to the *rupture of the spleen* of the unfortunate victim of his brutal assault. This phrase, extenuating the crime, was repeated in the trials of almost all cases of assault by Europeans which ended in the death of Indians. We hear it too often in numerous cases concerning the murder of coolies (labourers) in tea-plantations. This was severely commented upon in Indian Press and caused bitter resentment among the Indians. These numerous instances not only brought home to Indian minds the utter callousness of Englishmen to Indian feelings and the little value they attached to lives of natives, but also exposed the sham of British justice, when Europeans were concerned.

By far the most important incident of this nature centres round the personality of an Irish Judge, Mr. Pennel. It not only throws a lurid light on the travesty of justice which occurs when an Englishman is the accused party, but also proves the extent to which even the highest authority in the land is guilty of this crime of denying justice to the Indian and shielding Englishmen from the clutches of law. The facts of the case may be summed up as follows:

On August 19, 1899, the Police Superintendent of Chapra district, named Corbett, kicked the bottom of a constable, Narsingh.

and the District Engineer, Simkins, hit him on the head with a rattan. Corbett then struck the man in the face with his fist causing him to fall against a house. Narasingh's fault was that he had declined to do forced labour for the District Engineer. He was admitted in hospital where it was found that his wounds were of a serious nature. Fearing that a complaint might be made, Corbett asked Narsingh to give up service, as otherwise he would be proceeded against in the court. As Narsingh did not do so, he was prosecuted, and the trying Magistrate, Maulvi Zakir Hussain, *under pressure from above,*[65] sentenced him to two months' rigorous imprisonment. He preferred an appeal before the District and Sessions Judge who was an Irish civilian named Pennel. Pennel allowed the appeal but invited trouble for himself. In his judgement he observed: "Assaults by Europeans upon natives are unfortunately not uncommon. They are not likely to cease until the disappearance of real or supposed racial superiority. It is proper no doubt that they should be punished, but excessive severity in punishing them, so far from improving, is more likely to exacerbate the relations between the two races, and to defeat itself. The better men among the native community are themselves disposed to make allowance for the irritability which this climate has a tendency to produce in the European character and the occasional acts of violence in which that irritability vents itself."

This judgement, passed on October 7, produced a commotion among officials throughout the province. Even the Lieutenant-Governor, Sir John Woodburn, was upset, and the Viceroy, Lord Curzon, considered Pennel's act as an abuse of "liberty of enquiry". Pennel was transferred to Noakhali by telegram.

Some time after, Woodburn went to Noakhali, called Pennel in his private room, and told him: "Seeing your judgement I have grave doubts whether you are fit for judicial employment. The judicial officers are my officers just as much as the executive, and I want them to do well. Mind, I am speaking for your benefit and guidance. Reading your judgement leads me to doubt whether you were really so impartial as you should have been. The vindictive rancour with which you pursued the policemen and the district officers makes me think you must have had some quarrel with them."

Pennel—"You may think like that, but a judgement like that was worth two National Congresses."

Woodburn—"As impartial man I pass my opinion."

Pennel—"I know your Government had done all they could to prevent truth coming out."

The Lt. Governor was a little agitated and said: "My Government! Be careful, Pennel, you had better be careful what you are saying."

Pennel—"You consulted the Legal Remembrancer whether witnesses need appear before me."

Woodburn—"Yes, I had every right to consult the Legal Remembrancer. It was a trumpery case."

Pennel—"Trumpery case! Should I have any reference about this matter to the High Court?"

Woodburn—"No, Pennel, I am not going to enter into any discussion with the High Court. I am speaking to you privately."

In another case, Pennel had remarked in his judgement: "In this country the only people who will come forward to give evidence against officers in the cases of this kind are those who do not mind their houses being burnt, their shops looted, their relations turned out of Government employment, themselves and members of their families dragged up on false charges and sent to Jail."

In Noakhali, Pennel got the Police Superintendent, Raily, arrested on a charge of perjury. Raily had attempted to secure 'liberty for a murderer by giving false evidence.' Pennel sentenced the murderer to death. This case made Pennel a hero, and on February 15, 1901, the day he delivered the judgement, 10,000 people followed him up to his bungalow calling him *Dharmāvatār* or a Daniel. But on a recommendation from the Government, the High Court suspended Pennel, and telegraphically ordered release of Raily on bail. When Pennel was leaving for Calcutta, 15,000 people of all classes silently accompanied him from his residence to the railway station. People were lined up on either side of the road on which was moving Pennel's carriage. Pennel became the idol of the educated classes in Bengal. Mr. J. Chowdhury, Bar-at-law and a prominent public man in those days, observed: "The people could not forget the fact that it was for the sake of justice that Pennel sacrificed his own prospects and it was the cause of justice which had alone actuated him to act up to the dictates of his own conscience."[66]

Mention has been made above[67] how justice was sacrificed by the English officers to protect the Indigo-planters, and these, naturally, were foremost in opposing the so-called Black Acts of 1849 which sought to bring them under the jurisdiction of the Indian officers. Similarly the Ilbert Bill, offering similar concessions to the Indians, was opposed tooth and nail by the tea-planters in order that, as a

British Lieutenant-Governor put it, they might beat and kill with impunity a few more niggars. Blunt remarked:

"Throughout the agitation on the Ilbert Bill, the planters had a considerable backing in the official world. It was evident that the two societies were united in a way which would have been impossible in old times, in their opposition to the native hopes."[68]

Tea-gardens offered numerous instances of miscarriage of justice when the European manager or his assistant was accused of inhuman atrocities perpetrated upon the coolies (labourers) or even of murdering them. Sir Bampfylde Fuller, Chief Commissioner of Assam, refers to two such cases. The following extract from his book, *Some Personal Experiences* (pp. 118-20), is most revealing in this respect.

"On some gardens there was a good deal of flogging, and I will mention two cases which had some interesting features. In one of them a woman was stripped and flogged. Her husband brought a criminal charge against the garden overseer. He was acquitted by an Indian Assistant Magistrate on the score that he acted under the orders of his European manager. No further action was taken. I heard of the case through a vernacular Assam newspaper. In dealing with offences of this kind, *it was essential to carry planting opinion with one,* and to use only just so much severity as would suffice to prevent their recurrence. I was not sure of the discretion of the District Magistrate, and while ordering him to take the case up against the Manager, I wrote to him, privately and confidentially, instructing him to impose a fine equal to a month's salary, should he find the man guilty. This was done. The Manager appealed to the High Court. But, *rather to general surprise*, the sentence was upheld. Many years afterwards, when dining at the Bengal Club with some High Court Judges, a discussion arose on the perennial subject of the complete independence of the judiciary from executive interference. I maintained that some guidance might be of advantage, and told the story of this case. One of the company burst out laughing.

"It was I who heard the appeal," he said. "Your duffer of a magistrate had left your confidential letter pinned to the record. I felt mad for a while, but concluded that, after all, things had gone for the best."

"The other case was still more serious. A coolie who had been flogged with a strirrup leather, under the direction of a young European assistant, was killed by the punishment. He suffered from an enlarged spleen and this was ruptured. The young man, named

Bain, was tried by a jury of planters, and, *according to popular opinion, was assured of acquittal.* But they found him guilty, and the judge—an officer of excellent discretion—sentenced him to eighteen months' simple imprisonment. This may seem to be an unduly light punishment. But it was a sufficient deterrent from the thoughtless use of flogging, and left the feelings of the planting community unscandalized. I explained this to the Government of India. But Lord Curzon was dissatisfied, and ordered that an appeal should be made to the High Court for the enhancement of the sentence. This raised a storm amongst the European community of Calcutta, and the judge who heard the appeal actually acquitted Bain altogether! I had felt very sorry for the youth. Beyond doubt, he had acted under the orders of his garden manager, and had refused to give him away—a married man with children to whom conviction would have been ruin. *I had arranged* that the English Police officer who escorted him to prison in Calcutta should make things as smooth as possible for him. Meeting this officer after his return, I was told by him that after a whisky peg Bain had grown communicative. 'You made one blooming error,' he said, 'You got hold of the wrong stirrup leather."[68a]

The first case shows that according to both the head of the Province and the judge of the highest court in India, an offence of the most brutal type, involving the most shameful public dishonour to a woman, did not merit any higher punishment than a fine equivalent to a month's salary, when the accused happened to be an Englishman, and the victim, an Indian.

Fuller's own statement of the second case reveals the mentality of Europeans about the value of Indian life and the immunity with which it could be taken by any European. To the credit of Lord Curzon it must be said that he stood up boldly against this outrage on Indian sentiments. For this Lord Curzon's Government was strongly denounced in the Anglo-Indian Press on the ground that there was undue interference with the freedom of the judiciary. Comment is superfluous and we need only refer to the case of Pennel and the draft letter written to the Magistrate by Fuller mentioned above. Lord Curzon's interference did one good. It proved that European judges, even of the High Court, sacrificed all judicial sense to racial arrogance.

It has been suggested by Lord Ronaldshay, the biographer of Lord Curzon, that the latter's interference in this matter was merely nominal and that he probably signed the documents as a matter of formality. But fortunately there are other cases on record where we have definite evidence that Lord Curzon took a bold step against similar outrages on Indians by Europeans. The detailed minutes which he drew up in connection with some of these cases throw very interesting light on the whole history of similar offences and also the lenient manner in which the high officials concerned looked upon them. Indeed Lord Curzon's stricture and denunciation are so revealing in character that no apology is needed for referring to these cases and to the minutes of Lord Curzon in some detail. The first case refers to an outrage committed in Rangoon on April 2, 1899. 'An elderly Burmese woman, named Ma Gun, while walking along a public road after performing her devotion at the Shwe Dagon Pagoda, was seized by one soldier. He was soon joined by other soldiers and they all carried the woman to some rising ground and successively ravished her. She was then taken into a hollow and were again ravished by other soldiers. Two Burmans and a Burmese woman, who were going along the road, reported the matter with the result that one soldier was caught on the spot but the rest dispersed. Some of the policemen who arrested this soldier stated that they saw this man rising from the woman 'who was lying on her back, practically naked and in an exhausted condition.' She was sent to the hospital, but her subsequent fate is uncertain. According to the letter from the Chief Secretary to the Government of Burma to the Secretary to the Government of India, she escaped from the hospital almost immediately after she was taken there, but it appears from a note by Mr. Taw Sein Ko, Government Translator, that the poor woman died in the hospital on April 4, and she remained almost unconscious after the outrage.'

In spite of the serious nature of the offence, and though one soldier was actually caught in the act, the authorities tried to hush up the whole matter and did not take any action, and Lord Curzon seriously took them to task and condemned them for their negligence of duty.

The second case refers to a regiment newly arrived at Sialkot. At 9-30 p.m. two soldiers asked a native cook to procure a woman for them, and for having refused to do so he was set upon and brutally beaten by two men of the 9th Lancers. They broke two of his ribs, and he was left lying out all night. On the next morning he was found in such a feeble condition that he had to be carried on a stretcher to the hospital. His dying deposition was taken by the Cantonment Magistrate, and the high officials, who visited the scene of the outrage, found the ground still covered with big patches of blood. On the day after, he seemed so much better that they thought he might pull through. Thereupon everyone, civil and military combined, conspired to hush up the whole affair. No inquiry was instituted, no evidence was taken, and until the man died a week or more later, nothing was done.

The above account is taken from a minute of Lord Curzon himself and there can be no question of doubting its authenticity in any particular. Lord Curzon concludes the above account with the following words: "In the *post mortem* the doctor found that the poor wretch had syphilis, but to contend that his death was due to any other cause than the savage assault by the soldiers, is out of the question."

Lord Curzon further states that within two months of the above tragedy some soldiers of the same regiment, namely, 9th Lancers, killed another native, a *punkha-coolie*, who expired from a kick inflicted upon him by a private.

As in the Rangoon case, so in the Sialkot affairs, the authorities hushed up the whole affair and Lord Curzon had to reprimand them severely. A perusal of the minutes of Lord Curzon and other connected papers on the subject show in a staggering manner the utter callousness of the military authorities regarding the murder of Indians by English soldiers. We learn from Lord Curzon's minutes that the authorities as a rule acted on the principle that these offences ought to be white-washed for fear of the scandal that they might cause. He says that this is the popular theory, but it is impossible for the Government of India to maintain it. Lord Curzon insisted that both the offending regiments should be punished as the soldiers conspired to withhold evidence against the particular offenders. The punishment was of a collective nature. The regiments were transferred to undesirable stations and were precluded from joining some ceremonial parades.

The following quotation from one of Lord Curzon's minutes on this occasion puts the whole situation in a true colour. Although it is a long extract it will repay perusal:

"When I came to this country I found that in spite of excellent pronouncements on the part of many of my predecessors, the number of cases of violent collision between Europeans and natives was increasing with a rapidity that appeared to me to be dangerous and menacing. *I found also that the general temper and inclination of the European, as illustrated by the attitude of many of our officers, both military and civil, by the tone of the English newspapers, by the verdict of juries and by any other test that it was possible to apply, was in favour of glossing over and palliating rather than of exposing and punishing these crimes.* I found that they were of more frequent occurrence in the army than elsewhere, not because the British soldier is a worse behaved individual than the British civilian, but because of the immense numerical superiority of the British army over any other class of white men in this country, because of the exceptional opportunities for accident and collision afforded by the shooting Rules as they then existed, and because of the contemptuous attitude that is entertained towards natives by the class from which the bulk of our soldiers are drawn. I found that in the recorded cases of violence between British soldiers and natives in the previous 20 years the result had been that 84 natives had been killed as compared with only 5 Europeans, and 57 natives seriously injured as compared with 15 Europeans, and 49 natives slightly injured as compared with 7 Europeans. I further found that so strong is the racial feeling in this country between the dominant and the subject race, that in the last half century on only *two occasions* have Europeans ever been hanged for the murder of natives, *though the cases proved against them may be counted by the score.* Then came the Rangoon outrage (which would never have been investigated at all but for my intervention, since when I first mentioned it to the then Commander-in-Chief nearly two months after it had happened, it had never so much as been reported to him); but from which I learned that *it was possible, even in the face of one of the most appalling and shameful outrages that can be conceived, for all the leading officers to join together in a conspiracy to defeat the ends of justice and to screen the guilty.* I have seen other cases—that of the soldier O'Gara at Umballa who smashed in the head of a *punkha-coolie* with a dumb-bell, that of the soldier O'Sullivan at Calcutta who murdered a tailor and then feigned madness, and many others, in which there has been *the most wholesale perjury and an attempt at all hazard to get the guilty European off.* I could allude to *a score of other cases* in which little or no assistance has been lent by the authorities involved towards the detection and punishment of obvious and palpable crime. Now what has been my feeling about these cases? I am not so foolish as to ignore the sentiment of racial prejudice which they illustrate or to sit in judgment upon what may seem to be the moral obliquity of my fellow countrymen.

"I know that as long as Europeans, and particularly a haughty race like the English, rule Asiatic people like the Indians, incidents of hubris (sic) and violence will occur and that the white man will tend to side with the white skin against the dark. But I also know, and have acted throughout on the belief, that it is the duty of statesmanship to arrest these dangerous symptoms, and to prevent them from attaining dimensions that might even threaten the existence of our rule in the future."[69]

It is hardly necessary to note that the English newspapers, as usual, were loud in their denunciation of Lord Curzon. But something more serious than this followed. During the time of the Delhi Durbar in 1903, when the 9th Lancers, guilty of the Sialkot crime, were passing in parade before the Viceroy and the assembled guests, they received hearty ovation from the European spectators. In reply the Indians heartily cheered the Viceroy. It was impossible to mistake the significance of all this, and Lord Curzon's biographer tells us that the Viceroy felt deeply hurt at this demonstration of his countrymen.

The following extracts from the correspondence between Lord Curzon and Lord George Hamilton are most revealing in respect of the attitude of Englishmen towards the Indians:

1. *Hamilton to Curzon, 6 July, 1899.*

"You do not seem to be making much progress in bringing to justice the perpetrators of the Rangoon outrage. I am very glad to find that, in our letters, which crossed, the same idea pervades both —that, if these guilty cannot be convicted for want of evidence, some punishment should be inflicted upon the regiment. I am somewhat perturbed at your remark that you believe that the number of cases of such outrages is on the increase. I have had an uneasy suspicion that such was the case, and I am afraid, that, if this is the fact, it is due to the knowledge that this class of offence can be committed with comparative immunity from the extreme difficulty of obtaining a conviction from the jury. I understand that, ever since Ripon raised, by his inconceivable stupidity, racial feeling in India, it has affected the decision of the juries in cases where they have to adjudicate between Europeans and Natives, and that, previous to Ripon's advent in India, it was easier to get juries, no matter what their composition might be, to look at the question submitted to them impartially rather than from the standpoint of the colour of the defendant. The British soldier is treated with far greater consideration in India than in any other part of the world, and he is surrounded with comforts and with attendants such as he never gets elsewhere; and if, under such conditions, he misuses his power or superior strength, I quite agree that it is for you to take some notice of such improper conduct. But pray, be very cautious and circumspect in anything that you propose. I admit that this class of outrage is perhaps more damaging to our rule, and creates more deep-seated resentment in the Native mind, than any class of transactions connected with our rule in India. To successfully arrest and diminish this class of offence it is necessary to carry with you, to a certain extent, Anglo-Indian opinion. I recollect Lytton issuing a Minute, the substance of which was indisputably correct, and in connection with a case in which a European, who had accidentally killed a Native, had been subjected to ridiculously lenient sentence. But it created a great uproar at the time, and undoubtedly subjected Lytton to very great unpopularity, and this diminished for the future his influence with Europeans in India."

2. *Hamilton to Curzon, 27 July, 1900*

"These cases, constant as they seem to be, of misconduct of certain members of the Civil Service, by which collisions are provoked with Natives, are very distressing. It argues a low tone and utter absence of either a sense of duty or of that honour which we are supposed to associate with gentlemen in responsible positions. About five and twenty years ago we tapped a very bad stratum of the social world, and the Indian Civil Service is, I think, now paying the penalty. The class from which many of the candidates then came was not only socially very inferior, but the boys had no University, and many of them no public school education. They were coached in London, lived in London, and got an entirely erroneous idea of what a gentleman's conceptions and aspirations should be, and were sent out to India at the worst stage of hobbledehoyism."

3. *Curzon to Hamilton, 17 September, 1900.*

"I am sorry to say that, in the whole of my campaign on the subject of these accidents and collisions, I meet with nothing but tacit discouragement and sublatent antagonism from the soldiers. They are banded together throughout India in a compact body, animated by the fiercest *espirit de corps*. They will wink at things done by a fellow soldier, which they would denounce if committed by a civilian. The moment one is censured, all the rest are up in arms. They cannot see why the poor soldier should not be allowed to go out, and shoot and harry at his own sweet will; and if in the course of the excursion a Native is killed, their attitude is that of a very fast bowler at cricket whom I once met, and who having killed a man by the ball jumping up and striking him on the temple, said to me, 'why did the d-d fool get his head in the way?' Nothing to me since I came to India has been more surprising or more disappointing than the attitude and capacities of the leading members of the Military service....I told the Commander-in-Chief quite plainly that I had not taken up this affair in order to be defeated or baffled....

"Since I last wrote to you there has been another bad case. At Dinapur, where as you know, there has been much ill-feeling between the soldiers and the Natives, one of the Munsters has stabbed a washerman."

(Curzon then relates that in Fort William a British soldier murdered an Indian tailor against whom he had a grudge and pleaded insanity. Another soldier hit a boy without any provocation with a stove and broke his leg.)

4. *Curzon to Hamilton, 28 August, 1901.*

"I was talking last night with MacDonnell about the case in the Cawnpore Cotton mill, which I mentioned to you last week. He admitted the flagrant inadequacy of the sentence imposed by the Magistrate; but said that it is of no use to take such cases to the High Court. Such is their admitted partiality and incompetence."

(In this case a European Supervisor kicked a *coolie* who lay insensible and unattended for 3 hours after which he was removed to his house where he died. The European was fined Rs. 300/-.)

5. *Hamilton to Curzon, 2 October, 1901.*

(Reference to the papers sent by Curzon on the Travancore Planter's case, in which a European planter flogged an Indian to death). "It would appear that in India, where we have established for generations a complete code of criminal law and procedure, *the European claims an immunity from punishment for murder and assault when committed upon the person of a Native that even in the wildest parts of West coast of Africa is not given to European officials."*

6. *Curzon to Hamilton, 29 January, 1903.*

"In this very week has come up another case of three soldiers who, in violation of the shooting rules, were engaged in shooting in the vicinity of a native village, and shot, though they fortunately did not kill, a native boy. They were then set upon and hustled by the villagers. The latter were tried by the District Magistrate, a young Englishman of only three years' service. *He delivered one of the most partisan and monstrous judgments that I have ever read,* letting the soldiers off scot-free, sentencing the villagers to savage terms of imprisonment, and inflicting ten stripes upon the wounded boy. Just before I left Delhi I had a similar case of three soldiers, who assaulted and shot a native Forest Guard down at Madras, who had come up and asked them what they were doing in the forest reserve. The three men were identified out of the whole regiment, though one of them had shaved off his moustache to escape recognition. They were proved to have been out shooting without passes on that day, they were proved to have been in the very reserve where the assault took place, and they were shown to be the only three British soldiers out shooting on that day. Nevertheless, because the Forest Guard was the only actual witness of the assault upon himself, and because he was a native, his testimony was discredited and the case against the men was dismissed. There, again, *the Collector delivered a judgment saturated with gross partiality. I spoke to Ampthill (Lord Ampthill, Governor of Madras) about it,* and the case is now being taken by Government for a re-hearing before the High Court. None of these cases are known to the public. *They are more or less successfully kept out of the newspapers,* and no one, except at headquarters, where, of course, the soldiers never say a word about the subject, has any knowledge of the state of things *that goes on from one end of India to the other, and of the terrible injustice that prevails.*"[69a]

Lord Curzon's minutes and correspondence have been quoted at some length in order to give a quietus to those apologists of British justice in India who have been able, after laborious research, to hunt out a few cases where Englishmen were adequately punished, even sentenced to capital punishment, by British judges, and parade them before the public. The conspicuousness of such instances is the best evidence of their rarity. Lord Curzon, than whom there can be no greater authority on this subject, categorically states that during the latter half of the nineteenth century only two Europeans were hanged for the murder of the natives, *though there were scores of such offenders whose crime was definitely proved.* The attitude of the British judges, juries and the Anglo-Indian public and newspapers, to which Lord Curzon has drawn such a pointed attention, proves, as nothing else could prove, the real attitude of the British towards the Indians, and it can be hardly denied that the Britishers who lived in India formed an unholy alliance to deny justice to the Indians as against any one with a white skin. These are no doubt strong words and a severe indictment which no historian should indulge in except on very conclusive evidence. But such evidence we possess in this particular case.

Sir Walter Strickland, a British Baronet, is the author of a small booklet, entitled *British Justice and Honesty,* from which a few extracts are quoted below:

"The English in India and elsewhere boast of their even-handed justice. As English by birth, my personal experience is that this boast has no foundation whatever....A Singapore paper not long ago stated that it was no uncommon thing for Burmese defendants to be flogged to death in their own prison at Rangoon....This *scharfrichter* mode of meting out "even-handed justice" is apparently had recourse to by the jaded, drunken alien to save himself the trouble of hearing the defence. I called on the editor of this paper and he assured me that his authority for the statement was unimpeachable. In spite of this, I should be inclined to doubt it, were it not for the following fact, notorious all over Rangoon. Not very long ago an Irish private soldier murdered a beautiful Burmese girl whom he was "in love"(!) with and her mother, and then raped one or both of the still warm bodies. For this little error of judgment he who awarded such comfortable quarters in Rangoon gaol that he has no desire whatever to quit them.... These instances, *which might be multiplied a hundred-fold,* are enough to demonstrate that the parochial English are quite incompetent to deal out even-handed justice when their own 'superior' race and 'inferior' 'nigger' ones are in question."

Apart from isolated cases of ill-treatment to individual Indians, some form of cruel treatment had hardened into a normal practice. Lord Minto, Viceroy of India (1905-10), when asked by the Secretary of State of the allegations of insolence and cruelty of the English towards the Indians, wrote in a letter, dated 28 May, 1906, to Morley: "It does exist, and to me it is galling to see a symptom of it, and if galling to me how much more so to them". But then he took comfort in the idea that things were much worse before. "He (Minto) had memories of bad dinners in Afghanistan, and young Neville Chamberlain's commonplace request to Sir Fred. Roberts—'Please, Sir , can I beat the cook?'—a ceremony at once approved and summarily performed."[69b]

Before bringing this review to a close it is necessary to point out that some of the worst phases of British attitude towards the Indians persisted throughout the century and they found their spokesmen in writers like Rudyard Kipling. It is hardly necessary to point out that the number of Englishmen, who formed their opinion from these writers and were influenced by them, exceeded more than thousand times those on whom the speeches and writings of the few liberal-minded Englishmen and friends of India produced any effect.

The Bengalis, who were more advanced in political ideas, were the *bête noire* of the Jingo imperialists. A strong anti-Bengali feeling, to which reference has been made above,[69c] marked the average Englishmen throughout the nineteenth century. To what extreme the vilification of the Bengalis proceeded, unchecked by sober Englishmen, may be judged from the following extracts from an article published in 1855 in the *Calcutta Review:*

"What Jew looked for any good thing out of Galilee? What Anglo-Indian looked for fighting in Bengal?....

"The cowardice of a Bengali is indeed a thing by itself....

"Like a *pate de foie gras* from Strassbourg, or *Eau de Cologne* from Jean Marie Farina, or shawls from Cashmere, or rose-water from Ghazeepore, cowardice from Bengal is the only genuine commodity of the name. All other specimens are but imperfect and spurious....

"Bengal of course must be inhabited by Bengalis, and what are Bengalis, but the sleek, cringing sircar, the fat plausible Baboo, the be-Bacon'd and be-Shakespear'd School-boy, the lying witness, the patient coolie, whom we meet every day? These are metropolitan specimens. Provincial Bengalis are the same, unsophisticated, and uneducated; mere varieties of the timid, cunning, perfidious race, which dynasty after dynasty has conquered, used and despised....

"First in the row, look at the Bengali; for in all his phases, as a citizen, a villager, a rich man, a poor man, a rajah, a ryot, an ignoramous, a school-boy, a Brahmin, a Sudra, a Bengali is the antithesis of a warrior. He is dressed unlike a man of action, according to our modern ideas of dress. Physically he is weak, effiminate, sedentary, of low stature, of dark colour, of mild countenance. He possesses an intellect susceptible of the highest polish, but not of remarkable strength or vigour. Morally he is cunning, treacherous, cowardly, avaricious, a victim to a degrading superstition, and, we must add, terribly false. No nation on earth presents a more uniform surface. But the man must have very little sense, or very little experience, who fails to detect a Bengali under any disguise. His slender frame cannot be concealed even by occasional obesity. No swaggering will cover his constitutional cowardice. No affectation or nonchalance his characteristic cunning. No education his national peculiarities. In his case it may safely be said—*Ex uno disco omnes* (From one you may learn all).

"Next, what is to be done with the Bengalis? They are certainly not savages; and yet what are they? Are they civilized or uncivilized? Calcutta philanthropists will, we suppose, decide for the former alternative; but we may doubt whether they are justified in doing so. If civilization means merely softness of character and manner, we allow that they are civilized. If civilization means a spread of education, erection of public works, commercial pursuits and such like, we allow that the country is civilized. But if civilization means that wholesome and prosperous state of society fitted for self-government, that good hearty condition, as Leigh Hunt has it, 'a state of manhood befitting man,' we cannot save ourselves from saying that Bengal of the Bengalis is not civilized. Civilization, in its highest sense, means a manly, vigorous, national existence at its zenith. We decline to award the name either to effete or to weak infantine societies. The Bengalis are in one or other of these positions. It is difficult to determine in which. But between the two alternatives, we may gather that Bengal civilization is not yet.

"Bengal of the Bengalis is a land of cowards and liars; and what remark can convey a more signal proof of hopelessness? A race of savages is more hopeful than a race of cowards and liars. Germs of civilized manliness may lie deep in the former; but the latter is a stock on which little good can be engrafted. What is to be done with a nation of cowards?...

"Bengal of the Bengalis is plainly then in no good way. A Morison's pill of Baboos in Council, or on the Sudder Bench, in whatever numbers, will not cure its distemper. We are curious to see what the new educational regime in the hands of Mr. Pratt will effect. In the meanwhile it must not forget its degradation. It must be ground down. It must be kept low, even in the dust. It is but a race of women, not men!"[70]

Such wild ravings might have been ignored as the result of eccentricity or mental aberration on the part of one or a few. But what gives them significance and importance is the fact that they were considered fit to be published in a reputed journal like the *Calcutta Review*, the most distinguished organ of the cultured English society. The passage is ostensibly a caricature of the Bengalis, but it is really a faithful pen-picture of the debased anti-Indian megalomania of a section, perhaps a large section, of the British community in India in the nineteenth century.

When the great Brāhma leader Keshab-chandra Sen visited England, he delivered a lecture containing powerful indictment of the general conduct of the Britishers in India in their dealings with the natives of the country, as well as of the excise policy (liquor traffic) of the British Government in India. Keshab was "unanimously and vigorously abused" by the Anglo-Indian Press and almost every Englishman discontinued his subscription to the *Indian Mirror*, edited by Keshab. An Englishman in Bombay publicly threw out a challenge that he would give Rs. 500 to anyone who would venture to read the lectures in his presence while he stood horsewhip in hand.[70a]

The Indian feeling in respect of such attitude of the Englishmen was best expressed by Professor Gilbert Murray of Oxford in his address at the opening of the Conference on Nationalities and Subject Races. We subjoin an extract:

"If ever it were my fate to administer a Press Law, and put men in prison for the books they write and the opinions they stir up among their countrymen, I should not like it, but I should know where to begin. I should first of all lock up my old friend, Rudyard Kipling, because in several stories, he has used his great powers to stir up in the minds of hundreds of thousands of Englishmen a blind and savage contempt for the Bengali. And many Bengalis naturally have read these stories. You cannot cherish a savage contempt for anyone without its being quickly reciprocated. And when both sides regard each other with the same savage contempt it is not likely that they can dwell together in peace. And in case Mr. Kipling should feel lonely in his cell, I would send him a delightful companion, Mr. Anstey of *Punch*. Year after year, clever natives of India come over to England at great sacrifice of money and trouble, to study in our Universities and satisfy the tests for obtaining positions in their own country. They compete with us well, and with all the odds against them. And year after year they have found in our greatest newspaper caricatures of themselves—ridiculous Baboos, cowardly, vain, untruthful, in every way absurd, talking bad and bombastic English (not nearly so correct, I suppose, as Mr. Anstey's Hindustani), held up for the amusement of the public. Now if these men are to be in any sense our subjects, that sort of thing is not fair play. It is not fair play, and it is not decent policy. If you must insult somebody, insult one who is free and can hit you back. If you want to govern a man, and to have him as a loyal and friendly citizen—well, you must give up that luxury. You cannot govern the man and insult him too. This incessant girding at the Bengali, the most intellectual and progressive of the peoples of India, has an ugly look. It goes along with much irritable hostility to the Congress, to the students, to almost every Indian society that professes high aims—such, for instance, as the Arya Samaj. There is in such sneers something perilously like jealousy. And if ever in a ruling race there creeps in a tendency to be jealous of its subjects, to hate them for their good qualities rather than their bad, to keep them out of power not because they are unfit for power, but because they are too obviously fit; such a tendency is, I believe, disastrous to any Empire, and the individuals and parties who foster and inflame it have forfeited their claim to stand among the great leaders and governors of the world."[71]

The last sentence in the above extract seems to give a very correct analysis of the Anglo-Indian mentality and reflects the sentiment of educated Indians during the latter part of the nineteenth century. But even the utterance of such eminent Englishmen had little salutary effect upon the power-intoxicated Englishmen in India.

That the arrogance and social exclusiveness of the British persisted up to the very end, would be apparent to any one who reads the account of Joseph Chailley, mentioned above. This distinguished Frenchman has described the British attitude towards the Indians as he found it at the beginning of this century, just at the close of the period covered by this volume. Some of his views have been quoted above.[72] He has also referred to the justification offered by the British for their social exclusiveness in India. Some Englishmen told him: "It is not we who keep the natives at arm's length, it is they who hold aloof from us. Caste and its rules, to say nothing of their personal tastes, prevents intimate relations". The Englishmen then described the orthodox customs like purdah. Chailley was also told: "Can innocent English girls or married ladies...........be really intimate with Indian women, who are so much nearer a state of nature and are slaves to their husbands"? A young Englishman said to Chailley, "The mere smell of a native woman would prevent one marrying her".[73]

Anyone who has any knowledge about the educated Indians—men and women—in the opening years of this century would find the hollowness and shameless character of these excuses. How far Chailley was deceived by these excuses and explanations of the British may be judged by his cursory remark that if a young English girl marrying an Indian in England arrives in India, she will not be received in English society. He also mentions that a Bengali I.C.S. told him, "My European colleagues treat me as an inferior and patronise me".[74] Blunt also repudiated the arguments of the Englishmen on the strength of his personal experience in India.[75]

The real explanation of the British attitude towards the Indians is to be found not only in racial arrogance and the mentality developed by a conquering nation towards the conquered, to which reference has been made at the beginning of this chapter, but also in certain inherent characteristics of the Englishmen. Mr. T.G.P. Spear has referred to many of these in his very interesting and illuminating book, *The Nabobs*, from which a few extracts are quoted at random.[76]

"Insularity of the English character made the English persist in their customs and habits of life even in most unfavourable circumstances." The Englishmen possessed "a maximum of national pride and a minimum of desire to understand the country". They thought "it was the extremity of bad taste to appear in anything of Indian manufacture", and exclaimed, "How nice India would be if it wasn't for the Indians". In reality "India became an unknown country to the English inhabitants of Calcutta and Madras". Blunt also observed: "No Collector's wife will wear an article of Indian manufacture to save her soul from perdition, and all her furniture even her carpets must be of English make."[77]

Chailley remarked: "The Anglo-Indian, whether he be an official or a non-official, is usually interested in India only by reason of the income he derives from it and the use which it is to his country".[78] Anyone who has dispassionately read the history of India in the nineteenth century would find it difficult not to agree, generally, with this observation.

It is, however, only fair to point out that the British attitude towards the Indians was partly the result of a superiority complex—the superiority of the white race over the black—which swept the whole of Europe during the nineteenth century. This has been very tersely put by an Englishman as follows: "There can be no question that the twenty-five years which have elapsed since 1884 have seen a change in the attitude of the white races of mankind towards their fellowmen of other hue and lineage, and in their avowed conduct towards them". The Christian teaching of human brotherhood "has given place to a pseudo-scientific doctrine of the fundamental inequalities of the human kind which, true as a statement of fact, has been exaggerated and made political use of to excuse white selfishness and white exclusiveness, and to reinforce the white man's pretension of rightful dominion over the non-white world at large."[79]

---

1. Mill, J. S., *Considerations on Representative Government,* Chapter XVIII, p. 113.
2. *Private Journal of the Marquess of Hastings,* p. 17.
3. Mill, II. pp. 109, 115, 148, 342, 365-6.
4. Garratt-I, 398-9.
5. Shore, F.J., *Notes on Indian Affairs,* 2 Vols. (1847).
6. Spear, T.G.P., pp. 134-44.
7. Chailley, p. 192.
8. *IHRC,* XXI. 50.
9. Mitra, Kishorichand, *Memoirs of Dwarakanath Tagore,* p. 53.
10. Ibid, 54.
11. Spear, T.G.P., 140.
12. *THG.* 306 (274). The bracketed figure refers to page number in 1958 edition.
13. *Memoirs,* 54.
14. Spear, T.G.P., 140.

14a. Vol. IX, p. 346.

15. *Life of Digambar Mitra,* I.110.
16. Emily Eden, *Up the Country,* p. 55.
17. Cotton-1, 42.
18. Garratt-II, 398. Cf. also, Mayhew, 147.

18a. Cf. p. 153.

19. See Vol. IX, pp. 918, 933-6.

20. See pp. 15-6.
21. See p. 285.
21a. Original Records in Madras Archives.
22. Spear, T.G.P., 141-2.
23. Routledge, 277-8.
24. Cotton-II, 65.
25. Cotton-I, 69-70.
26. H. P. Ghose, p. 26.
27. Ibid, 26-7.
28. Ibid.
29. Blunt-I, 152.
29a. Ibid, 263.
29b. Ibid.
30. Ibid, 264-66; cf. also pp. 140-41.
31. Ibid, 174.
32. The passage has been quoted in full in Vol. IX, p. 871.
33. *THG*. 391 (348).
34. Ibid, 391-2 (348-9).
35. Ibid.
36. Sunderland, 72.
37. Ibid.
38. Cf. Vol. IX, pp. 591-602.
39. Cotton-II, 79. For strong denunciation of the Whipping Act by the Indians, cf. four articles by Girish-chandra Ghosh, in the *Hindoo Patriot*, 12 September, 1861, and in the *Bengalee*, 24 February. 15 December, and 22 December, 1866. The last two disclose the horrible nature of flogging inflicted even for petty offences. A boy of eight, who stole a guava, died as a result of the flogging. (*Selections from the writings of Girish Chunder Ghose*, the Founder and First Editor of "The Hindoo Patriot" and "The Bengalee", edited by Manmathanath Ghosh, Calcutta, 1912, pp. 396, 576, 646, 654.
40. Garratt-I, 116.
41. Ibid, 115.
42. Ibid.
43. Ibid, 118. The term Anglo-Indian in this chapter includes all persons of pure or mixed British blood residing permanently or temporarily in India.
44. Blunt-I, 261.
45. Andrews and Mookerji, 85.
46. Blunt-I, 74.
47. Blunt-II 44-46; Blunt-I. 60.
48. Spear, 140.
49. Ibid, 141.
50. Blunt-I, 218.
51. *THG*. 414.
52. Cotton-II, 65-6.
53. Andrews and Mookerjee, 81.
54. Chailley, 193.
54a. See pp. 26-7.
55. Blunt-I. 265. For the incident, see above, pp. 347-48.
56. Ibid, 145.
57. Buckland, I. 428-9. Cf. G.C. Ghose's article in the *Hindo Patriot*, 11 May, 1854 (*Selections*, 159).
58. Garratt-I, 116-7.
59. Morrison, *Imperial Rule*, 27-8.
59a. Ibid, 28.
59a. Ibid, 38.
60. Cotton-II, 124-5. Italics mine
61. Cotton-II, 166-8. Italics mine.
62. Blunt-I, 163.
63. Cf. Vol. IX, p. 904.
64. Cotton-II, 111-3. Italics mine. A pension of Rs. 300 per month was granted to Cowan from the Indian exchequer (*Essays Presented to Sir Jadunath Sarkar*, Edited by Dr. H.R. Gupta, p. 121).
65. The trying Magistrate admitted that to avoid troubles, he consulted the District Magistrate beforehand. He said: "What I mean is that sometimes when cases are disposed of, and Magistrates do not like it, that they find fault and so I settled beforehand".

66. The full details of the case are given by H. Das Gupta in his Bengali work *'Bhārater Jātiya Congress'*, I. 204-15.
67. Vol. IX, p. 923.
68. Blunt-I, 268.
68a. The *italics* in the above extracts are not in the original.
69. Home Department Public A—1899, Nos. 220-250; December, 1902, Nos. 390-400. Italics mine.
69a. Unpublished Records in CRO, London. Italics mine. (These letters have since been published. Cf. A.K. Majumdar, *Advent of Independence*, pp. 319 ff.)
69b. *BPP*. LXXX. Part II (1960), p. 72.
69c. See pp. 23-4, 338-9.
70. *CR*. July, 1853. pp. 138-40, 146, 155-6.
70a. B.C. Pal, *Brahmo Samaj and the Battle of Swaraj in India*, p. 60.
71. Quoted in the *Modern Review*, VIII. 463.
72. See pp. 340, 355.
73. Chailley, 195.
74. Ibid, 193.
75. Blunt-I, 262.
76. For these extracts, see pp. 126, 142, 182.
77. Blunt-I, 248.
78. Chailley, 197.
79. Blunt-I, 233.

CHAPTER X (XLVIII)

BRITISH POLICY TOWARDS INDIA

The final collapse of the Maratha powers and the consolidation of the British dominion in India quickened the imperial instincts of Britain, and henceforth the British people looked upon this vast subcontinent as their own. Though nominally India was the posession of a private trading company, the British Government treated her as an imperial domain, existing for the benefit of the English people as a whole. This idea, though of gradual growth, was firmly established during the period under review. Nor was it unnatural: Lord Ellenborough wrote to Queen Victoria in January, 1843, that "he can see no limit to the future prosperity of India if it be governed with due respect for the feelings and even the prejudices, and with a careful regard for the interests, of the people, with the resolution to make their well-being the chief object of the Government, and not the pecuniary advantages of the nation of strangers to which Providence has committed the rule of this distant empire."[1] But it was a big "If". Such a lofty ideal of ruling a conquered country for the interest of the conquered had no place in the practical politics anywhere in the world. It is a curious coincidence that at the very moment when Ellenborough penned these lines, a British historian told the very plain truth that "it is remarkable that the interests of India should be invariably sacrificed whenever they are the subject of British legislation."[2]

It is easy to pick up from the writings and speeches of Englishmen, and even from the Acts of the British Parliament, 'pious platitudes', and occasionally even sincere professions, of the high ideal of ruling India for the interest of the Indians alone, treating Indians with justice and fair play, and making an earnest effort to make them fit for ruling their own country. Nor is it difficult, on the other hand, to quote very frank expressions to the effect that India was a conquered country, and must ever remain so for the benefit of Englishmen. The history of Indo-British relations leaves no doubt that the latter class alone represented the real voice and will of the British people as a whole, whatever might have been the views of individual Britons.

A generous sympathy towards the Indians and their political aspirations was expressed by many Englishmen, including high officials.

This is what we find in *The Private Journal of the Marquess of Hastings* under date, the 17th of May, 1818:

"A time not very remote will arrive when England will, on sound principles of policy, wish to relinquish the domination which she has gradually and unintentionally assumed over this country, and from which she cannot at present recede. In that hour it would be the proudest boast and most delightful reflection that she had used her sovereignty towards enlightening her temporary subjects, so as to enable the native communities to walk alone in the paths of justice, and to maintain with probity towards their benefactress that commercial intercourse in which we should then find a solid interest."[3]

Elphinstone wrote in 1819 that 'the most desirable death for us to die of should be the improvement of the natives reaching such a pitch as would render it impossible for a foreign nation to retain the Government; but this seems at an immeasurable distance..... A time of separation must come; and it is for our interest to have an early separation from a civilised people, rather than a rupture with a barbarous nation, in which it is probable that all our settlers and even our commerce would perish, along with all the institutions we had introduced into the country."[4]

Only a few men were sufficiently far-sighted to realize that a paternal foreign government contains within itself the seeds of its own decay. Next to the Marquess of Hastings and Elphinstone a writer in the Anglo-Indian paper, the ***India Gazette***, made a remarkable statement in 1820, which has proved to be almost prophetic in character. After referring to the spread of education, establishment of peace and security, and other benefits of the British rule, he continues: "All these will have the inevitable effect of qualifying the people of India for enjoying political and civil liberty and of furnishing them both with the will and the power to claim what they deem to be their rights. The separation of India from Great Britain cannot in the nature of things be prevented. It must come sooner or later; and after appropriating to the mother country all the advantages which colonial possessions can confer during the period of our rule, the true system of governing them should aim to provide that the separation shall be safe, gradual and friendly, whenever it may take place, so as to prevent the possible evils and secure the greatest benefits both to Great Britain and her colonies when the power of the former shall cease."[5]

Thomas Munro also expressed a similar view: "We should look upon India, not as a temporary possession, but as one which is to be maintained permanently until the natives shall in some future age have abandoned most of their superstitions and prejudices, and become sufficiently enlightened to frame a regular government for themselves, and to conduct and preserve it. Whenever such a time shall arrive, it will probably be best for both countries that the British control over India should be gradually withdrawn."[6]

Sir Charles Trevelyan also hoped that as a result of education the Indians would achieve independence without any struggle or mutual exasperation and "we shall have exchanged profitable subjects for still more profitable allies."[7] That many others, even some English officers, held similar views between 1829 and 1832, is testified by Jacquemont's letters from India.[8] All these were cast into shade by the speech of Lord Macaulay in the House of Commons in the course of the discussion of the Charter Act of 1833. The following passage has become classic, and though often quoted, will bear repetition.

"It may be that the public mind of India may expand under our system till it has outgrown that system; that by good government we may educate our subjects into a capacity for better government; that, having become instructed in European knowledge, they may, in some future age, demand European institutions. Whether such a day will ever come I know not. But never will I attempt to avert or to retard it. Whenever it comes, it will be the proudest day in English history."[9]

As the nineteenth century rolled on such sentiments gradually evaporated. By the end of the century, even the most liberal British Premier would not go further than what Gladstone observed in 1877: "Our title to be in India depends on a first condition that our being there is profitable to the Indian nations; and on a second condition that we can make them see and understand it to be profitable"; or said by way of passing remark 'that India should be ruled by the Indians.'[10] But these casual expressions did not really mean much.

As a striking contrast to these views reference may be made to the characteristic expressions of some high officials. Lord Ellenborough said in the House of Lords: "Our very existence depended upon the exclusion of the (Indians from) military and political power. We have won the empire by the sword and we preserve it by the same means." Lord Elgin also held out the threat that India was conquered by the sword and shall be held by the sword.[10a] Lord Salisbury, who held the office of the Secretary of State for India before he became Prime Minister of Great Britain, spoke in the same strain. He spoke of the "blackman" with that indefinable menace of disdain, characteristic of the English Grand Seigneur. And it was he who cut short with a sharp word the mournful complaint about Indian wrongs presented by a member of Parliament: "What good these hypocrisies?..... The Hindus know that they are governed by a 'superior race'. When a man has a black, red, or yellow skin, and I should add when he has the 'Providential' chance of being governed by whites, he ought not to have, he has not in fact, an opinion. It is enough to bow down and utter thanks."[11] Reference has been made above to similar expressions of views during the debate on the Council Act of 1892.[12] In a public meeting in A.D. 1886, while discussing the Home Rule Bill for Ireland, Lord Salisbury remarked: "There were races like the Hottentots and even the Hindus, incapable of self-government."

The views of British statesmen during the last quarter of the nineteenth century more or less conformed to this pattern. They were determined not to grant representative institutions to the Indians nor to diminish the number of European officers in India. A few extracts may be quoted from the correspondence between the Secretary of State and the Viceroy[12a] to indicate the spirit of British administration in India.

1. *Cross to Dufferin, 17 February, 1887.*

"Of course anything like a representation with a population of 250 millions is absurd—and it is never to be forgotten that the claims are raised by the educated few, very few in comparison with the population, but by a noisy and educated few."

2. *Cross to Lansdowne, 23 January, 1890.*

(After referring to the Congress agitation for Permanent Settlement, an outcome of "the great blunder perpetuated in giving Bengal such a settlement," Cross proceeds:)

"This, however, to my mind, affords an additional reason for the greatest caution in the matter of adopting in any form the elective principle. It was the election of some 86 Home Rulers which gave Mr. Gladstone's mischievous scheme such an impetus....I am very glad at all events to find that both Lord Dufferin and yourself are entirely opposed to its being applied to the Supreme Council. I think that such a step would be fatal to our rule in India. As regards the Provincial Councils, I know from private correspondence that both Lord Reay and Lord Connemara are entirely against it, and I presume that their Councils would be of the same opinion."

3. *Hamilton to Curzon, 14 April, 1899.*

"We cannot give the Natives what they want: representative institutions or the diminution of the existing establishment of Europeans is impossible. That being so, it seems to me that we can only cultivate reciprocally friendly relations with them by showing interest in them personally, and by utilising opportunities for coming in contact with representative men and representative bodies."

4. *Hamilton to Curzon, 5 January, 1900.*

"Looking at the extreme difficulty of proposing any fresh measures or schemes which will fit in with the aspirations of 'young India,' it is most desirable to encourage in every way we can 'older India.' It was through the noblemen and country gentlemen of India that the earlier civil servants of the East India Company governed the country."

The British statesmen paid but scant attention to the views of the educated Indians. It would be hardly an exaggeration to say that they had supreme contempt for them. The two following extracts are illuminating:

5. *Cross to Lansdowne, 11 April, 1890.*

"I read the comments on the Indian Councils Bill in the Indian papers, with much interest, and am well satisfied. I care nothing for the Babu comments."

6. *Hamilton to Elgin, 16 September, 1897.*

"If we can keep the affection of the fighting races and higher orders of society in India, we can ignore the dislike and disaffection of the intellectual non-fighting classes, the baboos, students and pleaders."

The attitude of the British towards the appointment of Indians to senior administrative posts in India has been described later in detail. One or two interesting points may be noted here.

There was a proposal from Lord Cross that an Indian should be a member of the Secretary of State's Council. Dufferin and his Executive Council opposed this chiefly on the ground that no suitable Indian could be found for such post. How little suitability counted in these matters will be evident from the following letter from Lord Hamilton to Lord Elgin, dated 12 November, 1896.

"There is a strong feeling here that the Government should in some way mark its appreciation of Dr. (J.C.) Bose's remarkable labours and researches in science. The highest scientists here express great admiration of the little man, who is undoubtedly the foremost scientific authority amongst the educational officers of the Indian Government, both European and Native. He receives, however, the native salary, only two-thirds of the salary of an European.....To bring his salary up to the European standard would be an awkward precedent, but I think your ingenuity could suggest some other means of meeting his merits."

It was thus a fixed policy to keep even the senior Education Service a close preserve for the Europeans. That this was not at all due to superior merits of the latter was admitted even by Lord Curzon. On 1st October, 1901, he wrote to Hamilton:

"The other day I saw with pleasure that you had appointed to the Indian Educational Service a young and distinguished Indian Graduate named Mr. Harinath De. I think this was a wise step. Our English professors and lecturers out here about whom I wrote recently to Godley, take such little interest as a rule in their pupils, and perform their duties so mechanically, and with so little real enthusiasm in their work, that perhaps a Native of ability, and who has received a good University training in England, may do better."

Yet, for many years to come, the appointment of an Indian to the Indian Educational Service was an exception rather than the rule.

The British Governors-General, with perhaps a few exceptions like Ripon, were guided by the principles described above. Some of them, like Lytton and Curzon, made no secret of their motives and actions, while in most others, particularly Ellenborough, Dalhousie, and Dufferin, there was a wide gulf between professions and practices. But Ripon was decried and insulted by the Englishmen in India as will be described later.

Worse fate befell Sir Charles Trevelyan, Governor of Madras, who disapproved Wilson's financial budget presented in February, 1860, embracing proposals for three taxes—income tax, a licence duty and an excise duty on home-grown tobacco,—and described its main provisions as "three tremendous taxes." His unfavourable view in respect to the budget, besides exercising great influence with his colleagues at Madras and his principal officers, affected public opinion throughout Southern India. He then allowed the local newspapers to publish the protest which he had deemed it his duty to record against the proposed taxation. This publication caused excitement at Calcutta and other centres of opinion in India, and was thought to constitute an official collision between the Government of Madras and the Supreme Government. Sir Charles Trevelyan shortly left Madras (having been recalled by the Government of England) amidst the regrets of the whole country—European and native—in the Madras Presidency.[12b]

Lord William Bentinck has earned fame and popularity by his various reforms, notably the abolition of *Sati*, the introduction of English as the medium of higher education and the appointment of the Indians to higher appointments. But he was an imperialist to the core, and never desired the real uplift of India. This would be evident from his policy towards Mysore and the annexation of Coorg, Cachar and Jaintia, to which reference has been made above.[12c] But more revealing in this respect is his Minute of 13 March, 1835, i.e. just on the eve of his retirement from India. He emphasized the fact that in India "one hundred millions of people are under the control of a Government which has no hold whatever on their affections." So he held that "spread of knowledge and operation of the press weaken the respect for European character and prestige for British superiority," and "regarded the higher elevation of character, knowledge, improved morality, courage, etc., on the part of the Indians as internal evils from the point of view of the British Government." The irony of the whole thing is that it is to this Bentinck that Macaulay paid the following tribute which has been accepted by posterity as genuine truth: "Who never forgot that the end of government is the welfare of the governed; whose constant study it was to elevate the moral and intellectual character of the Government committed to his charge."

The India Office was. as a rule, antagonistic to the political aspirations of the Indians, for "the council of the Secretary of State has always been the stronghold of reactionary officialdom." As Mr. Hume put it, "the India Office is an organization perpetually employed in popularizing the official view of all Indian questions."[13]

The non-official Englishmen may be divided into three classes in respect of their attitude towards India. The majority of them made no secret of their imperialism of the Jingo type, to which an artistic literary expression was given by Rudyard Kipling. This is what could be naturally expected, and it is not difficult to understand their point of view. If it is realized that every one out of five Englishmen depended for his livelihood on Indian dominion, it would be idle to expect an average Englishman to be willing to forego the hold of England over India from abstract considerations of justice and fair play. Human nature being what it is, this attitude can be easily excused, even though Indians cannot possibly sympathise with it. But far less excusable is the conduct of those Englishmen who uttered liberal views with a mental reservation that these had no application to the east of Suez.

The most outstanding personality of this type was John Morley, the shining light of the British Liberal Party and the author of the

Life of Gladstone. He was regarded as one of the most liberal-minded statesmen, and the Moderate party of the Indian National Congress pinned their faith on him, but he was really no friend of India.

When in 1885 Lord Randolph Churchill advocated a Royal Commission of Enquiry into Indian affairs, Mr. Morley delivered a violent attack on Lord Randolph's scheme, speaking of "an excitable mass of barbarism rampant in India," which, he said, the Royal Commission would inflame.

Mr. William Digby, well-known for his very valuable services to India, who published an account of his interview with Mr. Morley in the *Amrita Bazar Patrika* of January 22, 1901, gave it as his definite view that "Mr. John Morley was never an ardent friend of Indian aspirations and, so far as I know, is not now." He (Morley) said, he would not agree that Gladstone, at Limehouse, in what he said about India, spoke for the Liberal Party.[14]

But Morley was merely a representative of a class, to whom reference is made by Sir John Lawrence: "The difficulty in the way of the Government of India acting fairly in these matters is immense. If anything is done, or attempted to be done, to help the natives, a general howl is raised which reverberates in England, and finds sympathy and support there. I feel quite bewildered sometimes what to do. Everyone is, in the abstract, for justice, moderation, and such-like excellent qualities; but when one comes to apply such principles so as to effect anybody's interests, then a change comes over them."[15]

While the overwhelming majority of the Englishmen belonged to one or other of the two types mentioned above, a few non-official Englishmen, who made an earnest endeavour to study the actual condition of India in a detached spirit, formed a small but distinguished class by themselves. They not only expressed great concern for the miserable plight of the Indians but also frankly denounced the iniquities of the British Government and held it to be primarily responsible for this sad state of things. The boldness with which they exposed the real nature of the British administration and its injurious effect on India are above all praise, particularly when it is remembered what an amount of odium and unpopularity they thereby incurred among their own people. It is the public conduct of this handful of Englishmen that kept up for long an illusion in the mind of a large section of politically minded Indians about the generosity and sense of justice of England. To the very last, these Indians clung almost pathetically to the belief that England was sure to do justice to India. This belief exercised a considerable influence upon the Indian politics of the nineteenth century.

Apart from this factor of great importance, it may be pointed out that these few Englishmen echoed the real views and sentiments of the advanced political thinkers among the Indians who, for obvious reasons, could not give public expressions to them with the same frankness and boldness as characterised their English sympathisers. For gaining a true insight into the real Indian view of the British rule in India during the nineteenth century, one cannot do better than peruse the speeches and writings of these few Englishmen who may be regarded as the "friends of India" in the true sense of the term. It is necessary, therefore, to refer to this at some length.

One of the earliest of this noble band of Englishmen was George Thompson, whose six lectures, delivered in Manchester at the latter part of the year 1839, and published in the form of a book three years later, constitute a grave indictment against the British administration in India, as will be seen from the extracts quoted above.[16]

While every single word in these long extracts—and in the book as a whole—echoed the feelings and sentiments of politically conscious Indians, it would be difficult to name any Indian politician who dared give expression to them in public. It is a lurid commentary on the Indian National Congress that up to the very end of the nineteenth century its leaders never went beyond what Thompson said in 1839, and even seldom approached his level.

John Bright was a worthy successor of Thompson. "In the famous debate on Sir Charles Wood's India Bill of 1853, Mr. Bright entered a vigorous protest against the system of Government established in India and categorically pointed out nearly all the defects of that system, some, if not most, of which are still applicable to the present-day arrangement. In his passionate eloquence he called the attention of the House to the extreme inadequacy of Parliamentary control over the administration of India which both sides of the House formally agreed in proclaiming as a 'solemn sacred trust,' though neither side raised its little finger even to treat it as more than a grazing common. He held that there was no continuity or consistency of any settled policy with regard to India, while everything was allowed to drift, there being no real disposition to grapple with any difficulty; that Indian opinion was unanimous in calling for a constitutional change and in complaining of the delay and expense of the law courts, the inefficiency and low character of the police and the neglect of road-making and irrigation; that the poverty of the people was such as to demonstrate of itself a fundamental error in the system of Government; that the statute authorising the employment of Indians in offices of trust was a dead letter; that the continuance of the system of appointments and promotion by seniority in the covenanted service was a 'great bar to a much wider employment of the most intelligent and able men among the native population;' that taxation was clumsy and unscientific and its burden intolerable to a people destitute of mechanical appliances; that the salt-tax was unjust and the revenue from opium precarious; that the revenue was squandered on unnecessary wars; that the Civil Service was overpaid; that there was no security for the competence and character of the Collectors whose power was such that each man could make or mar a whole district; that Parliament was unable to grapple fairly with any Indian question; that the people and Parliament of Britain were shut out from all considerations in regard to India, and that 'on the whole the Government of India was a Government of secrecy and irresponsibility to a degree that should not be tolerated."[17]

Five years later (1858) John Bright said:
"The population of India were in a condition of great impoverishment and the taxes were more onerous and oppressive than the taxes of any other country in the world. Nor were the police arrangements, administration of Justice, the educational policy and the finances in a satisfactory condition."[18]

Charles Bradlaugh also had great sympathy for India. In a speech in the Parliament on 31 December, 1883, he said: 'I am of opinion that we have obtained our authority in India in a great part by means, of which we ought to be heartily ashamed. And I think if we continue to govern India there is the weightiest duty upon every Englishman and Englishwoman to take care that the despotic authority of England should be used, as much as it can be, to redeem our past and to make our Indian fellow-citizens desirous of being governed by us.'[18a].

Samuel Smith, a member of the British House of Commons, visited India twice, once in 1863 and again in 1886. After his second visit he wrote his own impression of this country, particularly the changes he had noted among the educated people. He seems to have studied the Indian situation with great care and circumspection and hit unerringly at the vital points. His representation of Indian views and suggested remedies remarkably agree with those expressed by contemporary Indians, but gains additional strength from the impartial character which must be attributed to the observations of an English politician favouring reforms in India.

In his small pamphlet, *India Revisited*, Smith refers to the extreme poverty of India. He observes that "there is now an educated native tribunal by which our actions are closely scrutinised. This constitutes a totally new element in Indian problems as compared with former times."

He analyses as follows the principal objections urged by the Indians against the British rule.

I. It is too expensive and drains the country of its wealth, The European officers are very highly paid and spend most of their salaries outside India. Their pension is a heavy drain. The cost of the army is also very high as a white soldier is paid three or four times more than what a native sepoy gets. Most of this money is also spent in England.

II. India is saddled with the cost of expeditions in which she had no interest, as for example Kabul Expedition and Egyptian Expedition.

III. Growth of foreign trade at the expense of home industry.

IV. England forced upon India a fiscal policy not suited for her, but adapted to develop Britains' commerce.

V. Exclusion of natives from all higher posts in the administration.

Smith observes that the Indians do not desire to get rid of British rule. What they wish is not to overthrow British authority but to mould it into a truer Indian form, and above all, to get a substantial share of the administration and an effective voice in determining the policy of the Government. The main reform upon which the Indians insist in order to achieve the above purpose is the election of representative members to the Legislative Councils of India. The impression of the Indians is that the English officials stand between them and their just rights and claims. No such complaint is made of the British people, and there is a strong belief among the Indians in their sense of justice and good faith. Indians also object to the constitution of the Council of India in London. As it consists mainly of retired officials of India it merely serves as a court of appeal from the acting bureaucracy in India to the retired bureaucracy in London.

Smith suggested a few remedies for the grievances of the Indians. These may be summed up as follows:—

1. Return of a few members directly from India to British Parliament.

2. Election of a proportion of the Council of India in London by the Indians.

3. Inclusion of elected representatives in the various Councils of India.

4. Greater admission of Indians to Civil Service by holding simultaneous examinations in India.

Smith concluded by saying that these reforms are certainly not revolutionary.

H. M. Hyndman was also a great well-wisher of India. This will be quite clear from the following passages from his letter written to Robert Ruies La Monte who requested him to write an article on India:

"I recognise to the full the importance of putting the truth about India before the American people and American Socialists. What a time it takes to force any truth home. I began writing on India in 1874. My articles in the *Nineteenth Century* in 1878-79 were translated into nearly every known language. Yet here we are, thirty years later, with all that has been done in the meantime, still met by the grossest ignorance and the most insurmountable prejudice. Our role is heinous to India in every way.... It is very, very sad, to see a glorious old civilisation, capable of the highest development, crushed under the unsympathetic and unimaginative capitalist domination of our race. And things are getting worse instead of better. The men of to-day are inferior to the men of yesterday and our accursed English hypocrisy and colour prejudice shuts us out from real knowledge of Indian life."

Once he wrote to Dadabhai Naoroji 'that little could be done for India until we had a revolution here.... The same class.... —the capitalists—which is ruining you ruins also our own workers."[19]

Fawcett was another genuine friend of India, whose views and activities will be referred to in Chapter XIII.“ In 1870 he vehemently protested against the orthodox practice of introducing the Indian Budget at the fag end of a session to be silently debated before empty benches. He maintained that India was a poor country and complained that the British public failed to appreciate the dangerously narrow margin upon which the mass of the population lived on the verge of starvation. In 1871 it was at his instance that a Parliamentary Committee was appointed to inquire into the financial administration of India, he himself being elected as its President. All this time India was keenly watching the movements of the one man who was, single-handed, fighting her cause against tremendous odds, and in 1872 a huge public meeting in Calcutta voted an address to Fawcett expressing India's deep gratitude towards him and urging him to continue the fight in defence of her dumb and helpless millions which he had voluntarily and so generously espoused. At the general election of 1874, Fawcett, like many other Liberals, lost his seat for Brighton and for the first time in those days, India seemed to have practically risen to the exigencies of the situation. A subscription was at once started in this country and a sum of £750, in two instalments, was remitted to England to enable Fawcett to contest another seat at the earliest opportunity, and soon after Fawcett was returned member for Hackney."[20]

There were a few other Englishmen of the type represented by Thompson, Bright, Hyndman and Fawcett. Reference may specially be made to Hume, Wedderburn and Cotton. The names of these true friends of India are remembered with gratitude by the Indians even today for their sympathy with, and active support to Indian aspirations, though their voice was merely a cry in the wilderness and had had no effect on practical politics.

So far as the British people in general were concerned, they were mostly ignorant about India and had no definite opinion either for or against her, so long at least as their material interests were not affected. Raja Rammohan Roy, in the thirties, and Dwaraka-nath Tagore in the forties, of the nineteenth century, were warmly received by many notable persons in Britain. Rammohan Roy was requested to place his views about the reforms in Indian administration before a Committee of the House of Commons and was given a respectful hearing. Dwaraka-nath was invited to lunch and dinner by Queen Victoria. The citizens of Edinburgh presented him an Address in which they expressed the hope that in India "the rod of oppression may be for ever broken, and that the yoke of an unwilling subjection may be everywhere exchanged for a voluntary allegiance."[21] All this was said just before the most unjust annexation of Sindh and the tyrannical coercion of Gwalior by Ellenborough,[21a] but these did not provoke any reaction among the English public.

The reception of Keshab-chandra Sen in England in the sixties was reminiscent of the old days. The election of Dadabhai Naoroji to the British House of Commons clearly testified to the sympathy which a section of the British public still had for India, but the violent denunciation of him by the Conservative Party, including its prominent leaders, was a rude reminder of the change that had come over the British people. The general popular sympathy and respect for India grew less and less in proportion to the assertion by the Indians of their right to govern themselves. The reception—rather rejection—of the world-famous poet Rabindra-nath in London offers a sad contrast to that accorded to his grandfather Dwaraka-nath, and shows that much water had flown by the Thames during the interval.

Throughout the nineteenth century the people of Britain as a whole had been supremely indifferent to India and took little interest in Indian affairs. This was condemned by Macaulay and Thompson as far back as 1833 and 1839. The passage in which seventy years later Lord Curzon passed a severe indictment on Englishmen for this reason has become almost classic and would bear repetition.

"I sometimes think that the most remarkable thing about British rule in India is the general ignorance that prevails about it in England. Seventy years ago (i.e. in 1833) Lord Macaulay said, in his speech about the Government of India, that a broken head in Coldbath Fields produced a greater sensation amongst us than three pitched battles in India. Twenty years later Lord Dalhousie, that celebrated proconsul, wrote that nothing short of a great victory or a great defeat in India was sufficient to create in English society even a transient interest in Indian affairs.

"But I think that things have somewhat advanced since those days. Communications have greatly improved between the two countries; postal and telegraphic charges have been cheapened; more cold-weather visitors come out to us in India every year; and there is always an intelligent minority of persons here who follow, with the utmost interest, everything that goes on there. Yet, in its main essentials, the indictment still remains true, and you have only to look at the morning newspapers, to see that, with rare exceptions, the average Englishman is much more concerned in the latest football or cricket match, in a motor trial, or a wrestling encounter, than he is in the greatest responsibility that has been untertaken by his fellow-countrymen on the face of the earth."[22]

But although the Englishmen in general knew little and cared less about India, their imperial instincts were naturally opposed to any real advance of Indian interests. As one of them put it, they were sorry for the Indians, but they must place their own interests above all other considerations. This conviction, dictated by material considerations, was strengthened by the views of the reactionary Englishmen. It is the writings of this class of Englishmen, and not those of Thompson, Bright, Fawcett and a few other liberal-minded Englishmen, which both reflected and shaped the views of the average Englishman at home. It is hardly necessary to say that the views of the Englishmen in India were most reactionary and this also had effect upon the Englishmen at home, for they have always a blind faith on the men on the spot. The state of things in 1856 is thus described by Sir John Kaye:

"To suggest that in an Asiatic race there might be a spirit of independence and a love of country, the manifestations of which were honourable in themselves, however inconvenient to us, was commonly to evoke, as the very mildest result, the imputation of being 'Anti-British,' whilst sometimes the 'true British feeling' asserted itself in a less refined choice of epithets, and those who ventured to sympathise in any way with the people of the East were at once denounced as 'white niggers'. Yet among these very men, so intolerant of anything approaching the assertion of a spirit of liberty by an Asiatic people, there were some who could well appreciate and sympathise with the aspirations of European bondsmen, and could regard with admiration the struggles of the Italian, the Switzer, or the Pole to liberate himself, by a sanguinary contest, from the yoke of the usurper. *But the sight of the dark skin sealed up their sympathies.* They contended not merely that the love of the country, that the spirit of liberty as cherished by European races, is in India wholly unknown, but that Asiatic nations, and especially the nations of India, have no right to judge what is best for themselves; have no right to revolt against the beneficence of a more civilised race of white men, who would think and act for them, and deprive them, for their own good, of all their most cherished rights and their most valued possessions."[23]

How little these ideas were changed in course of time may be judged from the following statement of Malleson who, with Kaye, were the joint authors of the *History of the Sepoy War in India.*

"More than thirty years have elapsed since the Mutiny was crushed, and again we witness a persistent attempt to force Western ideas upon an Eastern people. The demands made by the newfangled congresses for the introduction into India of representative institutions is a demand coming from the noisy and unwarlike races which hope to profit by the general corruption which such a system would engender. To the manly races of India, to the forty millions of Muhammadans, to the Sikhs of the Punjab, to the warlike tribes on the frontier, to the Rohillas of Rohilkhand, to the Rajputs and Jats of Rajputana and Central India, such a system is utterly abhorrent. It is advocated by the adventurers and crochetmongers of the two peoples. Started by the noisy Bengalis, a race which, under Muhammadan rule, was content to crouch and serve, it is encouraged by a class in this country, ignorant for the most part of the real people of India, whilst professing to be in their absolute confidence. The agitation would be worthy of contempt but for the element of danger which it contains....

"Concession to noisy agitation on the part of the ruling power would place the lives, the fortunes, the interests of the loyal classes of India at the mercy of the noisiest, most corrupt, and most despised race in India."[24]

The ignorance and indifference of the British people towards India, except when their material interest was at stake, was reflected in the action of the British Cabinet as well as in the deliberations of the Parliament. Since the transfer of the administration to the Crown in 1858, no opportunity was given for a free discussion on the affairs of India, such as was offered by the periodical revisions of the Charter of the East India Company, which was regarded with a jealous eye by many who did not share its profits. The check afforded by this wholesome jealousy was now gone, and since 1858 there was "no account of stewardship, no day of reckoning for official delinquencies."

The manner in which the British Government now superintended the Indian affairs is thus described by Wedderburn:

"In theory, the Secretary of State in Council is supposed to be the servant of the House of Commons; and in theory, he is supposed to occupy a position of judicial impartiality, as the Court of Appeal for Indian grievances. But neither of these suppositions has any foundation in fact. In point of fact, no matter which Party is in power, the Secretary of State, as a member of the Government commanding a Parliamentary majority, is not the servant but, in Indian matters, the master of the House of Commons; and in dealing with the independent member who questions his authority, he does not even affect impartiality, but comes before the house as the indignant apologist of the department for which he is responsible.

"In other departments of the administration, an independent member, seeking redress of grievances, gets ready support from the Front Opposition Bench. But this is not so in the case of a Radical daring to voice India's complaint of destitution, famine, and pestilence. Him a Tory Secretary of State denounces for his malignant, though unaccountable, want of patriotism, while the ex-Minister, emerging from his retirement on the Liberal benches, re-echoes these sentiments, praises his own past administration, and proclaims the unspeakable blessings of British rule. With a few honourable exceptions, the London Press follows suit, finding subject for amusement when the House empties itself, as soon as it is a question of India's suffering, not seeing any shame in this shameful disregard of national duty."[26]

Blunt also makes similar scathing comments: "The India Office", says he, "represents of necessity the traditions of the past, and the

Council, which was designed to check it, has proved a more conservative and acquiescent body than even the old Board of Directors, its prototype and model. The reason of this is obvious. The Council, composed as it is almost exclusively of retired civil or military servants, views Indian matters from the point of view only of the Anglo-Indian service. It is even less amenable than this is to the influence of new ideas, and is more completely out of touch with modern native thought. Its experience is always that of a generation back, not of the present day, and it refuses, more persistently even than the younger generation in active service, to admit the idea of change.

"Thus the Secretary of State, who is dependent on this blind guide, is in no other position at home than is the Viceroy in India. Ignorant, as a rule, of all things Indian, and dependent for advice on the India Office and his Anglo-Indian Council, he never gets at the truth of things, and blunders blindly on as they direct."[25a]

The Press is justly regarded as the Fourth Estate in Britain, as it largely reflects as well as influences public opinion. It is therefore significant to note that, as a general rule, the British Press reflected the imperialist view. It expressed no sympathy for the political regeneration of the Indians or their economic development, and always opposed any economic policy which had the remotest chance of clashing with the interests of the British people. While a few liberal-minded Englishmen expressed their sympathy for India, John Bull's real voice was heard through the Anglo-Indian and British Press. One specimen would suffice. In a series of letters to the *Englishman,* a writer, who styled himself Britannicus, poured out day after day and week after week the most violent and offensive trash that ever was penned. Referring to Pherozeshah Mehta's speech on the Ilbert Bill in a public meeting held at Bombay on 28 April, 1883, he wrote:

"It also shows not only that *we must hold India by the sword,* but that we must encourage as many loyal men as possible capable of using the sword to settle in the country, if we wish to hold India successfully against enemies who are not to be despised. In order to effect this desirable object, the only safe policy for Government to pursue is to encourage as many Britons as possible to settle in the country by throwing open the services to them, by fostering instead of hampering tea, indigo and other European industries and by refraining from degrading Englishmen by subjecting them to the criminal jurisdiction of conquered and emasculated races".[26]

If anyone supposes that this vitriolic attack was an unnatural outburst due to the heat caused by the Ilbert Bill agitation, the impression would be removed by the editorial of the London *Times* on the Proceedings of the First meeting of the Indian National Congress in Bombay in 1885, quoted in Chapter XV, which breathes the same spirit. It hurled forth thunder against the Congress for making demands for political reforms, which were generally regarded in India as extremely moderate, and made it clear that the British would not yield to talk but only to sharp sword. This policy of holding India by the sword also swayed the British Cabinet and British statesmen, though it was occasionally hidden under the cloak of sweet phrases or nominal concessions. The Indian National Congress came to be looked upon as the gravest potential danger to the British rule and the Government of India adopted various means to curb its growth. British imperialism was at the height of its power at that time and India was justly regarded as the crest-jewel of the British Empire. No wonder, that the British were determined never to let go its hold upon India.

As a specimen of the imperial demeanour displayed by the British statesmen, attention may be drawn to the following letter addressed by the Secretary of State, Lord George Hamilton, to Lord Elgin, the Viceroy of India.

"I observe that in the debate on Budget one of the Native Legislative Members spoke of our Government as an alien Government. I think this is the first time that the obnoxious expression has been used at any official gathering. The speech seemed to me to have been a carefully prepared one, and which, not improbably, was written out or drawn up in England.

"Mr. Naoroji and his colleagues are becoming more and more violent in their language here, and he is consequently losing whatever little influence or weight he might previously have had. I understand that he trades a good deal on the assumption that he has influence at the India Office, and can act as an efficient intermediary between the Secretary of State and various interests and individuals in India. As soon as it is known that any request, memorial, or petition which passes through his hands, or with which he is in any way connected, is prejudiced from the very fact of having been associated with him, I have no doubt his influence will even more rapidly decay and vanish. Long residence in England and association with the least reputable portion of the political world have hopelessly deteriorated whatever brains or prescience he may originally have possessed."[27]

As will be shown later in Chapter XIV, Dadabhai Naoroji was noted for his unflinching loyalty to the British throne and moderate views on Indian politics. He was elected to the British Parliament and regarded as one of the greatest Indians of his age. All over India he was hailed as the 'Grand Old Man' in his later life. The views expressed about him by the Secretary of State for India in the last sentence would give a rude shock to every Indian, and perhaps also to not a few Englishmen who knew him. But still more important is the evidence it gives of one of the worst phases of intoxication produced by the wine of imperialism.

All this was the result of a deliberate policy that the Indians should not be granted any higher political status. It was often hidden under the cloak of a humanitarian feeling for the "Indian poor, the Indian peasant, the patient, humble, silent millions, the 80 per cent. who subsist by agriculture."[28] Lord Curzon openly declared that the Indian masses "should be the first and the final object of every Viceroy's regard." Hence the great Viceroy did not offer any political concessions to the educated classes because he "did not regard it as wisdom or statesmanship in the interest of India itself to do so." Lord Curzon repudiated "the claim constantly made that a man is not merely a Bengali, or an Uriya, or a Mahratta, or a Sikh, but a member of the Indian nation." "I do not think," said he, "it can yet be said that there is any Indian nation, though in the distant future some approach to it may be evolved." But, he added in the same breath, "however that may be, the Indian is most certainly a citizen of the British empire. To that larger unit he already belongs".[29] But this is to be understood with the distinct corollary that the Indians must always play the under-dog within that empire, petted and humoured, but always subservient to the British masters.

The mentality of the English in respect of India is clearly reflected in the deliberate policy of ignoring solemn declarations as well as provisions of the Acts of Parliament. The Charter Act of 1833 placed the Englishmen and the Indians on the same footing in respect of participation in Indian administration by laying down that "no native of India nor any natural-born subject therein, shall, by reason only of his religion, place of birth, descent, colour, or any of them, be disabled from holding any place, office or employment under the Company."[30] This principle was reaffirmed in the Royal Proclamation of 1858 by which Queen Victoria assumed the administration of India in her own hands. It is doubtful if even those who drafted them had any serious inclination ever to give effect to it. In any case both documents remained a dead letter. Lord Lytton had the candour to admit that they were deliberately ignored, as will be evident from the extract from his confidential minute quoted above.[31]

It was not, however, long before the British Government took good care to demonstrate publicly that the old policy was changed in favour of a new one which openly marked the Indians with a stamp of inferiority so far as recruitment to public services was concerned. On the recommendations of a Commission appointed in 1886 to reorganise public services, these were divided into two nearly water-tight compartments, the higher one, called Imperial, being practically reserved for the British and the lower one, called Provincial, alone being open to the Indians.[32] Even some Englishmen had the candour to admit that "such a system bore the stamp, barely disguised, of racial discrimination, at variance with the spirit, if not the letter, of the Queen's proclamation." We can easily imagine the effect of this upon the sentiment and sensibility of the large body of Western-educated Indians, who believed, with good reason, that they were not a whit inferior, in any respect, to the English recruits, and that this badge of inferiority was solely due to less whitish colour of the skin.[32a]

The policy, referred to by Lord Lytton, dominated the counsels of the British Cabinet throughout the nineteenth century. Thus the Secretary of State, Lord Hamilton, wrote to the Viceroy, Lord Elgin, on 7 May, 1897: "I do not think we should put very prominently forward the Queen's Proclamation of 1858. As a piece of English it is fine, but 40 years' practice has shown the extreme difficulty of giving effect to the academic utterances as to equality of races....."

This British policy towards India was not materially changed down to the end of the nineteenth century. Lord Curzon, who came out to India as Viceroy in 1899, may be regarded as the typical representative of British statesmen in so far as their attitude towards the Indians was concerned. His speeches and activities give us a fair measure of the British imperialism, in its best form, so far as it solidified itself towards the close of the nineteenth century.

Lord Curzon had no sympathy with the political aspirations of the educated Indians, and had a particular grudge against the Indian National Congress. In a letter written to the Secretary of State for India, dated 18th November, 1900, he says: "My own belief is that the Congress is tottering to its fall and one of my greatest ambitions while in India is to assist it to a peaceful demise". He was equally determined to keep the higher administrative offices in India as a special reserve for Englishmen. He not only ignored the demands of the Congress, repeated year after year, for the appointment of a gradually increasing number of Indians to higher offices, but even went a step further. In a letter to the Secretary of State dated

April 23, 1900, he referred to "the extreme danger of the system under which every year an increasing number of the 900 and odd higher posts that were meant, and ought to have been exclusively and specifically reserved, for Europeans, are being filched away by the superior wits of the natives in English examination".[32b]

The Secretary of State, Lord George Hamilton, fully endorsed these views and wrote to Curzon on 17 May, 1900: "The large scale preponderance of Natives in appointments above a certain grade as compared with Europeans always fills me with apprehension as regards the future. The preponderance will increase rather than diminish. All the educational influences at work in India tend to widen rather than to narrow the inlets into our administrative service. One of the greatest mistakes that ever was made was the issue in the Proclamation annexing India of the principle that perfect equality was to exist, so far as all appointments were concerned, between European and Native."

Lord Curzon, who stoutly defended this policy, sought to explain away the meaning of the Charter Act and Queen's Proclamation by specious arguments. In his Budget speech before the Legislative Council on March 30, 1904, Curzon mentioned two general principles regulating the public appointments in India.

"The first is that the highest ranks of civil employment in India, those in the Imperial Civil Service, though open to such Indians as can proceed to England and pass the requisite tests, must, nevertheless, as a general rule, be held by Englishmen, for the reason that they possess, partly by heredity, partly by up-bringing, and partly by education, the knowledge of the principles of Government, the habits of mind, and the vigour of character, which are essential for the task, and that, the rule of India being a British rule, and any other rule being in the circumstances of the case impossible, the tone and standard should be set by those who have created and are responsible for it. The second principle is that outside this *corps d'elite* we shall, as far as possible and as the improving standards of education and morals permit, employ the inhabitants of the country, both because our general policy is to restrict rather than to extend European agency, and because it is desirable to enlist the best native intelligence and character in the service of the State. This principle is qualified only by the fact that in certain special departments, where scientific or technical knowledge is required, or where there is a call for the exercise of particular responsibility, it is necessary to maintain a strong European admixture, and sometimes even a European preponderance."[33]

When Gokhale pointed out that this was at variance with the principles laid down in the Charter Act of 1833 and the Queen's Proclamation of 1858, Curzon observed:

"I am familiar with both those documents, and I also remember—which those who quote them sometimes forget—that the late Queen's words contained a qualification, not indeed modifying their generosity, but limiting their application by the necessary tests, firstly of practical expediency, and secondly of personal fitness. These were the words: 'It is our will, that so far as may be, our subjects of whatever race or creed be freely and impartially admitted to offices in our service, the duties of which they may be qualified by their education, ability, and integrity duly to discharge.' There is not one sentence in that memorable paragraph from which any Government of India or any Governor-General has ever either desired or attempted to recede. But the Hon. Mr. Gokhale's historical references stopped short at 1858. He altogether forgot to mention the findings of the Public Service Commission of 1887, which deliberately laid down that the service in India should in future be divided into two branches, firstly, an Imperial Service called the Civil Service, to be recruited by open competition in England only; and, secondly, a Provincial Service recruited in India, and consisting almost entirely of natives of this country."

Lord Curzon's bold assertion that no Governor-General or the Government of India had ever desired to recede from the pledges given to India is not only belied by the practice of the Government of India in filling up higher appointments, but is in striking contrast to the candid confessions of Lord Lytton and Lord Hamilton quoted above.

As to the first, a passage in a letter from Lord Cross to Lord Lansdowne, dated 6 June, 1889, is most illuminating. Referring to the "recommendation of the Public Service Commission as to the raising of the age of the examination of candidates before the Civil Service Commissioners", he writes: "Though I am favourable to it myself, the large majority of my Council are against me—for two reasons—1st, they think that too many natives will get in; 2nd, they think that it will be very hard upon parents of English boys to keep them at school so long."

As to the second, the confidential despatch of Lord Lytton, quoted above,[33a] clearly admits that the policy was never given effect to. Who spoke the truth? Lytton or Curzon? No one today—either British or Indian—would have a moment's hesitation in answering the question. Lord Curzon's assertion, therefore, is a very lamentable negation of another bold statement made by him about the same time, namely, that the ideal of truth was a virtual monopoly of the West.

Hamilton had the candour to admit that he regarded the Queen's Proclamation a mistake, thereby implying that it had the same meaning as Gokhale attached to it. But Curzon had not the honesty to follow his chief, and defended his position by what may be called a piece of casuistry. It was most disingenuous on the part of a Viceroy, who was an astute politician to boot, to put the recommendations of a Public Service Commission on the same category as, and capable of infringing, an Act of Parliament or a solemn declaration of the British sovereign.

Lord Curzon quoted figures to show how the principles of public appointment, enunciated by him in the extract quoted above, 'are vindicated in practice'. According to his own statement the progress of higher appointments given to Indians from 1867 to 1904 is indicated by the following figures:

Even in Provincial Service, generally meant for Indians, in the highest grade of Rs. 700-800 per month, the proportion of Indians rose from 5 to 13 per cent. during the period; in the next grade (600-700), from 15 to 27 p.c.; and the next lower grade (500-600), from 9 to 25 p.c. But these were all subordinate posts. In the superior posts, which formed the steel-frame of the Government, to use Lloyd George's happy phrase, there were only 12 Indians out of 648 in 1867, and 92 out of 1370 in 1903. This was the "progressive increase in native employment," which, in the opinion of Lord Curzon, rendered altogether "fallacious" the charge of the educated Indians that "we give an inadequate representation to the ability of the country in our Government."[34]

Lord Curzon triumphantly declared, with an eye to the outside world opinion, that the British empire employed less than 6,500 of its own countrymen and 21,800 of the inhabitants of the country itself.[35] This was a trap for an unwary reader, as it was no doubt intended to be; for the fact is that it was the result of a jugglery, unworthy of a Viceroy. For Curzon got the number 21,800 by including all posts bearing a salary of Rs. 75 per month, and upwards. But, as noted above, of the 1370 superior officers, who really shaped the policy of the administration and supervised its execution, only 92 were Indians in 1903, i.e. less than 7 p.c., after more than a century of British rule in India.[36] The form of Government in India may thus be described, by a parody of Abraham Lincoln's famous definition of democracy, as 'the rule of the Indians, by the British, and for the British.'

The principle or ideal to which Lord Curzon gave expression in the above extracts, fairly represents the British imperial policy towards India in its most developed form. But there was a brighter side in Curzon's conception of imperialism which found little echo in the hearts of his successors or of Englishmen either in India or in Britain. He wished to broadbase the British rule in India on strict principles of justice and equity within the limitations of the imperial policy as mentioned above. He hoped that to every Englishman in India, as he ends his work, might be truthfully applied the phrase, "thou hast loved righteousness and hated iniquity". The noble words in which he described, on the eve of his final departure from India, the duties of Englishmen to Indian people, constituting "Englishmen's justification (to be) in India", portray the other side of the shield of imperialism, which, alas! was ignored by most Englishmen. Lord Curzon had the candour to admit that "there are few of us who make anything but a poor approximation to that ideal." "But", he added, "let it be our ideal all the same. All other triumphs are tinsel and sham."[37]

It must be said to the credit of Lord Curzon that he carried his precept into practice. He was perhaps the only Viceroy who had the strength and courage to punish the Britishers for their brutal conduct towards Indian men and women. But the opposition he met with from the highest civil and military officials and the public insult he received for his generous conduct at the hands of his own countrymen in India tell their own tale.[38]

Lord Curzon's enlightened imperialism also led him to look upon the Government of India as the guardian "of Indian interests where they are liable to be impugned by external policy or influence". He is fully entitled to the credit which he claims in the following lines:

"We resisted to the best of our ability the heavy charge of more than three-quarters of a million sterling that was imposed upon Indian revenues by the increase of pay in the British Army —a measure about which we were not consulted and with which we did not agree. We protested more successfully against the placing upon Indian revenues of the charge for the entertainment of the Indian guests at the Coronation in London. We were also successful in resisting the suggestion that India should pay £400,000 per annum for a call upon a portion of the British garrison in South Africa. We have now finally established the principle (disputed till a few years ago) that when we lend troops from India to fight campaigns for the Imperial Government in different parts of Asia and Africa, every rupee of the charge, from embarkation to return, shall be defrayed by the Imperial Government."[39]

The real significance of Lord Curzon's achievement may be realized if we remember that the costs of the Burmese and Afghan wars and even of the military expedition to Abyssinia in 1867, as well as the expenditure of entertaining the Sultan of Turkey in a Ball dance at the India Office, were charged on Indian revenue.

Lord Curzon also waged a "battle in defence of the Indian emigrant in South Africa" against the harsh and discriminatory treatment accorded to him by the British Colonial Government of that country. Some of their measures, said Lord Curzon, "seemed to the Government of India to be unduly severe and inconsistent with the reasonable claims of the people of India as subject of the British Empire."

The preservation of ancient monuments in India is another feature of Curzon's high conception of British imperialism.

In his address to the Asiatic Society of Bengal on 7 February, 1900, Lord Curzon referred to the vandalism of the past rulers of India. After mentioning the destruction of Hindu temples by Muslim rulers and of Muslim sanctuaries by the Marathas and the Sikhs, he describes similar activities of the British officials in the past. In order to illustrate "how strongly the barbarian still dominated the aesthetic in the official mind", he cites the following instances: "In the days of Lord William Bentinck the Taj was on the point of being destroyed for the value of its marbles. The same Governor-General sold by auction the marble bath in Shah Jehan's Palace at Agra, which had been torn up by Lord Hastings for a gift to George IV, but had somehow never been despatched. In the same régime a proposal was made to lease the gardens at Sikandara to the executive engineer at Agra for the purpose of speculative cultivation. In 1857, after the Mutiny, it was solemnly proposed to raze to the ground the Jumma Musjid at Delhi, the noblest ceremonial mosque in the world, and it was only spared at the instance of Sir John Lawrence. As late as 1868 the removal of the great gateways of the Sanchi tope was successfully prevented by the same statesman."

Referring to the new policy which he proposed to adopt, Curzon observed: "To us the relics of Hindu, Mohammedan, Buddhist, Brahmin and Jaina, are, from the antiquarian, the historical, and the artistic point of view, equally interesting and equally sacred. One does not excite a more vivid and the other a weaker emotion. Each represents the glories or the faith of a branch of the human family.

Each fills a chapter in Indian history. Each is a part of the heritage which providence has committed to the custody of the ruling power."

These are noble words, and nobly did Lord Curzon carry out his high policy.

All these things indicate that Lord Curzon had an enlightened view of the British Empire. But it is significant to note that he visualised India of the future not as an independent kingdom, free from British control, as Munro, Elphinstone and Macaulay did before him, but as a member of the British empire. It indicates a great change in the attitude of England towards India—a mean between the extreme ideals of holding India by the sword and setting her up as a free State. Lord Curzon hoped that "history will recognize myself as having done much (whether wisely or unwisely) to accelerate the lifting of India from the level of a Dependency to the position which is bound one day to be hers, if it is not so already, namely, that of the greatest partner in the Empire". Unfortunately, the definite verdict of history is that he ruined the prospect of any such consummation.

Lord Curzon's conception of a Viceroy was that of a benevolent autocrat. But in the judgment of his career by the Indians the scale weighed heavily in favour of autocracy as against benevolence. Lord Curzon's career in India also illustrates another characteristic of imperial statesmen of Britain, namely, the wide gap between profession and practice. It would be difficult, for example, to improve upon the following words in which he paid tribute to the value of public opinion in India: "That public opinion has been growing all the while, is articulate, is daily becoming more powerful, cannot be ignored. To contend that it does not exist, that it had not advanced in the last fifteen years, or that it may be treated with general indifference is to ignore the great change which is passing over this country."[40] But in actual practice no Viceroy in India has so ruthlessly and systematically trampled upon public opinion as did Lord Curzon. Evidently, Lord Curzon reserved to himself the right to decide 'when public opinion was an exposition of views based on sober reasoning and supported by obvious justice, and when it was a mere frothy ebullition of irrational sentiments.' This was also typical of English statesmen.

In view of all that was said and done by Lord Curzon, it is hardly a matter of surprise that his administration, as a whole, was regarded with great disfavour by the Indians. His attitude was most reactionary and repressive in respect of the educated classes in India. There were four fields in which they had been steadily making their influence felt, but in all of them Lord Curzon's policy sought to put them back. He fettered the press by the Official Secrets Act, placed higher education under official control, took away the self-government in city Corporations—granted a quarter of a century ago—, abolished competition for high offices, and made everything dependent upon the pleasure of officials. He explained away the Queen's Proclamation, as noted above, and evidently thought that it was not to the interest of the Englishmen that educated classes should be more and more associated with the government of their country. So the Indians were led to believe that the British rule was maintained not to promote their interests but for a selfish purpose.

These views were forcefully expressed by Gokhale, the sober leader of the Moderate Party, in one of his speeches. In his address as President of the Congress in 1905 he drew the best pen-picture of Lord Curzon in the following words:

"His Lordship will always be recognized as one of the greatest Englishmen that ever came out to this country. His wonderful intellectual gifts, his brilliant powers of expression, his phenomenal energy, his boundless enthusiasm for work,—these will ever be a theme of just and unstinted praise. But even the most devoted admirer of Lord Curzon cannot claim that he has strengthened the foundations of British rule in India. Alas! the gods are jealous; and amidst such lavish endowments they withheld from him a sympathetic imagination, without which no man can ever understand an alien people, and it is a sad truth that to the end of his administration Lord Curzon did not really understand the people of India....For a parallel to such an administration we must, I think, go back to the times of Aurangzeb in the history of our own country. There we find the same attempt at a rule excessively centralized and intensely personal, the same strenuous purpose, the same overpowering consciousness of duty, the same marvellous capacity for work, the same sense of loneliness, the same persistence in a policy of distrust and repression, resulting in bitter exasperation all round. Lord Curzon's highest ideal of statesmanship is efficiency of administration. He does not believe in what Mr. Gladstone used to call the principle of liberty as a factor of human progress. He has no sympathy with popular aspirations, and when he finds them among a subject-people, he thinks he is rendering their country a service by trying to put them down.

"To him India was a country, where the Englishman was to monopolise for all time all power, and talk all the while of duty. The Indian's only business was to be governed, and it was a sacrilege on his part to have any other aspiration. In his scheme of things there was no room for the educated classes of the country; and having failed to amuse them for any length of time by an empty show of taking them into his confidence, he proceeded in the end to repress them. Even in his last farewell speech at the Byculla Club in Bombay, India exists only as a scene of the Englishman's labours, with the toiling millions of the country—eighty per cent. of the population—in the background. The remaining twenty per cent., for aught they are worth, might as well be gently swept into the sea!"[40a]

But Lord Curzon's crowning act of folly was the partition of Bengal which was carried out in the teeth of persistent and almost unanimous opposition of the whole of the province. Its wider effects on Indian politics will be treated in the next volume. It would suffice to state here that it chilled the enthusiasm even of the most moderate type of politicians, and many of them openly expressed in utter despair the futility of cherishing any hope for justice or generosity from the British Government. As a matter of fact, it is now generally recognized that it was his reactionary administration that practically killed the Moderate party in India, and facilitated the rise of an extreme section in the Indian National Congress, which ultimately changed the entire character of the organization and paved the way for the successful struggle against the British for the freedom of India. Lord Curzon's rule amply proves the dictum that sometimes oppressions of rulers are a blessing in disguise and produce an effect very much the opposite of what was intended by their perpetrators.

It is not necessary to say much about the non-official Englishmen resident in, or visiting India. That there were some, particularly among the missionaries, who felt genuine sympathy for the Indians, has been shown above in connection with the Indigo plantation. Unfortunately, the number of such men—men of the type of Rev. Long, Wilfrid Blunt or George Thompson—were so few that they could be almost counted on one's fingers. The general attitude of the Englishmen in India towards the enjoyment of civil and political rights by their fellow-subjects in India was fully displayed when they set up violent demonstrations against the so-called Black Acts of 1849 and the Ilbert Bill of 1883. The Englishmen in India showed their aversion to the political advance of India when the Indian National Congress put forth demands for administrative and constitutional reforms. With a few honourable exceptions, the non-official Englishmen were bitterly hostile to this political organization of the Indians. They not only ridiculed or abused it, as suited the occasion, but, with official help, tried to destroy it, or at least to neutralise its utility, by fomenting dissension and discord between Hindus and Muslims, and creating anti-Congress blocs among the people by patronizing all hostile demonstrations to the Congress.

Finally, one must consider that class of Englishmen, who had the largest share in shaping the destiny of India, and have been regarded, not without good reason, as the steel frame of British rule in India. This was the famous Indian bureaucracy, the corporation of Indian Civil Service, whose efficient administration of India was the most effective challenge to the demands for reforms. To a casual observer, specially an Englishman without intimate knowledge of Indian life and thought, the period of twenty years that intervened between the foundation of the Indian National Congress and the partition of Bengal, might well be regarded as an era of peace and material progress in India, for which the credit was entirely due to that paternal autocratic Government which controlled her destiny, almost as a divine dispensation. The scars left by the Mutiny were being gradually healed up, the revolutionary activity and the sentiment of disloyalty were things of the past, and the political activities of the people were now not only open and above board, but least likely to cause embarrassment or nervousness to the foreign ruling powers. The alarming prospects of a general outbreak envisaged by Hume in the early eighties totally disappeared, thanks to the masterstroke of his policy which turned the national feelings into a safe channel within controllable bounds, and the local disturbances that occasionally broke out here and there were not such as to disturb the equanimity of the rulers.

But to those who had eyes to see and ears to hear, and could dive beneath the surface, the outlook did not appear quite so pleasant. Grave discontent which prevailed among all shades of opinion and classes of Indians in the preceding period were enhanced rather than diminished, for though the causes remained more or less the same, the national consciousness grew more sensitive and the people as a whole more restive than before. In every age and country discontent has proved to be the seeds of rebellion, and India could not possibly be an exception to the rule. Yet, strangely enough, the Government did not take any serious steps to remove the grievances of the people. The British came to regard themselves as the trustees for the welfare of the Indian people, and the conviction was gradually growing upon them that this trusteeship would last for ever. This determined the attitude of the local officials who were now organized into a powerful bureaucracy. The absence of periodical scrutiny into Indian affairs, such as took place during the régime of the East India Company, and the indifference of the English people and their representatives in the House of Commons towards Indian questions, except when they touched their interest, virtually rendered the Indian Government a dictatorial authority, which brooked no criticism and had an unbounded faith in their own sense of what was right and proper for them to do in order to serve the interests of Indian people.

In order to understand the full implication of this changed state of things it is necessary to say a few words about the great transformation which the Government of India had undergone in the meantime. The rapid expansion of the British dominions and the growing needs of a modern type of State to which British India gradually conformed. led to the growth of a huge and complex administrative machinery with a large number of departments. The highest posts—the key-posts as one might call them—in this machinery were filled by the members of the Indian Civil Service recruited in England by competitive examination. The Viceroy's Executive Council which controlled the entire system was dominated by them. The District Officers at the bottom, as well as the Secretaries of the different departments at the top, who formed the pivot and pillars of British administration, were all recruited from them. As noted above,[41] it was the deliberate policy of the British Government to keep the I.C.S. a safe preserve for the youths of England, a policy dictated alike by the material interests of the Britishers and a desire to maintain the British character of the administration. The result was the growth of a strong fraternity—the *corps d'élite*—who formed a close hierarchy of official aristocracy. They have been not inaptly called the neo-Brahmins of India, having the same pretentions of intellectual superiority and social supremacy, leading inevitably to the same narrowness of outlook and the same spirit of exclusiveness. Even an Englishman, by no means friendly to the Indians, and full of admiration for the great intellectual ability, administrative efficiency and integrity of character displayed by the I.C.S.—virtues which a large majority of them undoubtedly possessed—has been constrained to refer to some of their drawbacks which, in the long run, brought them into conflict with the educated Indians and rendered nugatory all the high qualities which distinguished them as a class. The following passage, quoted from one of his books, puts in a mild form what most Indians felt as the crux of the whole problem and denounced in no uncertain terms.

"But the Secretariats, which from the headquarters of provincial governments as well as from the seat of supreme government directed and controlled the whole machine, became more and more self-centred, more and more imbued with a sense of their own omniscience. Even the men with district experience, and those who had groaned in provincial secretariats under the heavy hand of the Government of India, were quick to adopt more orthodox views as soon as they were privileged to breathe the more rarefied atmosphere of the Olympian Secretariats, that prided themselves on being the repositories of all the *arcana* of 'good government.' Of what constituted good government efficiency came to be regarded as the one test that mattered, and it was a test which only Englishmen were competent to apply and which Indians were required to accept as final whatever their wishes or their experience might be."[42]

Blunt's comment about the all-powerful I.C.S. is more to the point:

"The net result of his (Ripon's) Viceroyalty has been almost *nil*. Every measure that he has brought forward has been defeated in detail; and so powerful has the Civil Service been that they have forced the Home Government into an abandonment, step by step, of all its Indian policy. This they have effected in part by open opposition, in part by covert encouragement of the English lay element, in part by working through the English press.... The Anglo-Indian bureaucracy had shown itself his master in spite of Midlothian."[42a]

The great philosopher-statesman, John Morley, entertained the same opinion about the highly placed British officials in India from his experience as Secretary of State for India. Anyone who reads his *Recollections* cannot fail to be impressed by his frequent references to the orthodox, illiberal spirit of these officials, whom he called, on that account, by the hated Russian name of *Tchinovniks*. He looked upon them as the most reactionary element in the Government of India which thwarted at every step the generous move of the Home Government and the Viceroy. He held these die-hards in the Indian bureaucracy solely responsible for the popular discontent leading to unrest. He wrote to Lord Minto:

"It is not you nor I who are responsible for 'Unrest', but the over-confident and over-worked *Tchinovniks* who have had India in their hands for fifty years past."

Once, in great indignation, he wrote to Minto not to pay any heed to their advice. Writing in a lighter vein, he even suggested that some of them should be deported along with the terrorists under Regulation III of 1818. He wrote to Minto:

"To tell you the truth, the more I think both of—and—the less do I value the judgment of either one or the other. And now by the way, that we have got down the rusty sword of 1818, I wish you would deport—and—."[42b]

The first sign of the new spirit of the time could be easily seen in the gradually widening cleavage between the Civil Service and the English-educated Indians. There were many reasons for the growing conflict between the two, some of which are easy to understand. The I.C.S. as a class were guided in all their actions by a strong determination to raise their power and prestige, and at the same time to exclude the Indian element as far as possible from what they considered as their own preserve. This was naturally interpreted by the Indians as due to a selfish spirit of maintaining intact not only their own material interests and prospects but also those of the Service to which they belonged, and thereby indirectly of the entire British pople who would hereditarily enjoy those privileges. It has been claimed that although such selfish motives might not have been altogether absent, they were equally influenced by their conviction that they had better knowledge of the needs, interests, and wishes of the people of India, and were therefore more fitted to rule over the masses and look to their true welfare than the English-educated Indians who were out of touch with them and had little knowledge of, and less inclination to do good to, the ignorant and inarticulate masses of India.

On the other hand, the very natural desire of the Indians to take their due share in the administration was set down by the Englishmen to a sordid desire for loaves and fishes. But here, again, though consideration for the material interest of individuals or communities might not altogether be absent, one might, perhaps more justly than in the other case, give them credit for a more elevated sentiment or political wisdom which looked forward to the Indianisation of higher Services as the first step towards political advance of the country. That this is no mere surmise or theoretical speculation is proved by the persistent demand made by the press and from political platform for recuitment of Indians to the higher Services as the first step towards the reform of Indian administration.

It is hardly necessary to examine in detail the pretensions of the British bureaucracy in India that the interests of the people were more safe and secure in its hands than those of the educated section of their own community. There is not a single instance in the history of the world where the foreign rulers of a conquered country have more sincerely tried to achieve its moral and material interests than its own people. In any case, the undeniable fact of the growing and grinding poverty of the masses in India, to which detailed reference has been made above,[43] gives lie direct to the pretensions of those self-constituted trustees of the people or guardians of their interest.

Considerations such as these, entertained on both sides with equal firmness, gradually brought about an estrangement between the two, which ere long developed into an antagonism between the 'sun-dried bureaucrats' and the 'Bengali Babus' as they designated each other. This is all the more significant, if not deplorable, as the English-educated classes were the great champions of British rule in India, to secure whose co-operation and goodwill was one of the main planks in the administrative policy of the early British rule, such as is foreshadowed in the great Charter of 1833.

In view of what has been said above, it will hardly cause any surprise that the British authorities at Home were completely irresponsive to the just demands of the Indians, as formulated by the Indian National Congress.[44] It is true that, now and then, they made some concessions by way of reforms in the administration, as, for example, they did by the Acts of 1861 and 1892. But as has already been mentioned above, these concessions were always both halting and belated. The reforms which were conceded in 1892 would have fully satisfied the Indians in 1861, and similarly, to anticipate events, the reforms which were conceded in 1909 would have fully satisfied the Indians in 1892. But, as it is, the reforms which were actually granted in any one of these years failed to satisfy the just aspiration of the Indians, and the political discontent found vent ultimately in the growth of a national and radical school. It may be said without much exaggeration that the words "too late" were writ large on the door of India Office in London, and this characteristic of English politics is mainly responsible for undermining the strength of that political party in India which had implicit faith in the British justice and which hoped to attain their ends by constitutional agitation. The reason seems to be that the authorities at Home possessed very little knowledge of real India. All that they knew was from the reports submitted by the Government of India, and they did not take any adequate step to keep themselves acquainted with the real feelings and sentiments of politically conscious India. Besides, it was evident that, as before, the idea of safeguarding British interests dominated their whole outlook towards India. Reference has been made in a previous chapter to the enormous drain of wealth from India which formed a permanent feature of British rule in this country. There was no change in this aspect even though the British fully realised its character.

The British knew full well that the interests of India were sacrificed for those of Britian. The following account of the interview which Sir E. N. Baker, the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal, gave to Mr. Frank G. Carpenter, an American journalist, is very revealing:

"Said I: 'Suppose you were the absolute ruler of India, Your Excellency. Suppose you were not controlled by Great Britain, but that you had the same armies and the same administrative machinery that you have to-day, what would you do to better the condition of these people?"

"I would give them a protective tariff. I would encourage the establishment of factories and favour them in every way as to the making of goods for India in competition with those of Europe, Japan and other parts of the world. What India needs is industrial development, and a protective tariff would bring that about. As it is, we are tied up by the manufacturing industries of Great Britain. We can levy no duties to speak of upon our imports of cottons. We once had a tariff of 5 per cent., but the Manchester mill men objected, saying that it ruined their trade. They demanded that an excise duty be added to equalize our competition, and the result was that the duty was reduced to 3½ per cent., that amount being levied on all goods made in India. Do you wonder that the natives object? A protective tariff would foster our industries and we could in time build up a mighty industrial empire."

"Could you do this along other lines than the textiles?" "Yes. There is no reason why Indians should not make everything in Iron and steel."[44a]

But few Englishmen would endorse Baker's views. For example, Sir Roper Lethbridge held that to give India fiscal freedom—i.e., to permit her to impose protective tariffs upon English goods if she thought fit—would lead to the disruption of the Empire.[44b]

Apart from this economic question, another proof, if any were needed, was supplied by the admission of Sir Henry Fowler that the British were opposed to simultaneous examinations for the Indian Civil Service for political reasons.[45] This point was further emphasised by the fact that though a Resolution introduced by Herbert Paul for the simultaneous examinations of Indian Civil Service was passed by the House of Commons in 1893, it was not given effect to through the machinations of India Office and the Government of India.

Another settled policy of the British Government was to maintain their interest in India by playing one class against another. This policy of *Divide and Rule* took different shapes and forms according to circumstances. They tried to play the Hindus against the Muhammadans, the princes against the Indian people, and the common people against the educated classes. By this they proposed to hold the balance of power in their hands without creating any public discontent, as they would be in a position to point out that they had to maintain their position in India in order to safeguard the interests of the different classes and communities, who would, otherwise, fly at each other's throat. This aspect of the question has been partly discussed in Chapter VIII and will be more fully discussed in the next volume.

After all, it is difficult to deny that the whole British policy towards India has been beautifully summed up by the French statesman, Chailley, in a single sentence:

"India is one of the main pillars upon which the grandeur of the British Empire rests, and England will not willingly let her go."[46]

The same truth was more elaborately expressed, in a slightly different form, by a still more eminent foreign statesman, William Jennings Bryan, the Secretary of State of the U.S.A. He has exposed the character of the British rule within a small compass. His views may be summed up in his own words:

"The trouble is that England acquired India for England's advantage, not for India's, and that she holds India for England's benefit, not for India's. She administers India with an eye to England's interests, not India's, and she passes judgement upon every question as a judge would were he permitted to decide his own case." "The Briton has demonstrated, as many have before, man's inability to exercise with wisdom and justice, irresponsible power over helpless people. He has conferred some benefits upon India, but he has extorted a tremendous price for them. While he has boasted of bringing peace to the living he has led millions to the peace of the grave; while he has dwelt upon order established between warring troops, he has impoverished the country by legalized pillage. Pillage is a strong word, but no refinement of language can purge the present system of its iniquity."[47]

The moderate Indian view on the nature of British rule was summed up by Gokhale, the Prince of Moderates, in his Presidential Address at the Banaras session of the Indian National Congress in 1905. He passed a stern verdict on British rule in India: "For a hundred years England has ruled India, but four villages out of every five were without a school-house, and seven children out of eight grew up in ignorance." After mentioning how the solemn pledges of 1833 and 1858 regarding the appointment of Indians to higher administrative services were deliberately broken, Gokhale continued:

"Our whole future, it is needless to say, is bound up with this question of the relative position of the two races in this country.

The domination of one race over another, especially when there is no great disparity between their intellectual endowment or their general civilization, inflicts great injury on the subject race in a thousand insidious ways. On the moral side, the present situation is steadily destroying our capacity for initiative and dwarfing us as men of action. On the material side, it has resulted in a fearful impoverishment of the people. For a hundred years and more now India has been for members of the dominant race a country where fortunes were to be made to be taken out and spent elsewhere. As in Ireland the evil of absentee landlordism has in the past aggravated the racial domination of the English over the Irish, so in India what may be called absentee capitalism has been added to the racial ascendancy of Englishmen. A great and ruinous drain of wealth from the country has gone on for many years, the net excess of exports over imports (including treasure) during the last forty years amounting to no less than a thousand millions sterling. The steady rise in the death-rate of the country—from 24 per thousand, the average for 1882-84, to 30 per thousand, the average for 1892-94, and 34 per thousand, the present average—is a terrible and conclusive proof of this continuous impoverishment of the mass of our people. India's best interests—material and moral—no less than the honour of England, demand that the policy of equality for the two races promised by the Sovereign and by Parliament should be faithfully and courageously carried out."

Gokhale then turned to the bureaucracy, and bitterly blamed the system, adding that "the bureaucracy is growing frankly selfish and openly hostile to their (the educated classes) national aspirations. It was not so in the past." And he spoke of the different feeling within living memory, when the rulers looked forward to India's self-government. It was pretended that the people were indifferent, but "what the educated Indians think to day, the rest of India thinks to-morrow."

This represents the view of those who had unflinching faith in, and loyalty to, the British Government.

---

1. Colchester, 64-5. Italics mine.
2. Thornton, V. 356-7.
3. Panini Office Edition, p. 365.
4. Griffiths, 245.
5. B. Majumdar, 73.
6. Griffiths, 246.
7. O'Malley, 743.
8. *Letters from India*, 1829-32, translated by C. A. Phillips (1936), p. XXV.
9. Keith, I. 265.
10. Blunt-II, 175; Masani—*Dadabhai*, 304. But Gladstone's views were repudiated by Morley on behalf of the Liberal Party (cf. p. 388).

10a. Chintamani, p. 28 fn.

11. *Modern Review*, III. 519.

12. Vol. IX, p. 770.
12a. Unpublished records in the C.R.O. Library, London. These and other similar letters in this chapter have since been published (Cf. A. K. Majumdar, *Advent of Independence*, 346 ff.).
12b. Temple-II. p. 191.
12c. Vol. IX, pp. 37–46, 136–40.
13. Hume, 90.
14. *Modern Review*, II, 383. Cf. p. 383 above for Gladstone's statement.
15. Letter to Sir Erskine Perry, quoted in Chintamani, p. 13.
16. Cf. Vol. IX, pp 398-400. Cf. also Ch. XII.
17. Quoted in Mazumdar, A.C., pp. 9–10, along with extracts from other speeches.
18. Ibid, 11.
18a. Bradlaugh's speech is quoted by Hemendra Das Gupta in *Congress*, I. 48.
19. Masani—*Dadabhai*, 292.
20. Mazumdar, A.C., pp. 14–15.
21. Mitra, K.—*Memoirs of Dwarakanath Tagore*, pp. 85 ff.
21a. Cf. Vol. IX, pp. 202–33.
22. Raleigh, pp. 33-4. For Macaulay's speech, cf. Vol. IX, p. 315.
23. *Modern Review*, IV, 264.
24. Malleson, *The Indian Mutiny of 1857*, pp. 412-3.
25. Hume, 91-2.
25a. Blunt-II, 159–60.
26. Mody, *Pherozeshah Mehta*, I. 133.
27. Unpublished Records in C. R. O. Library.
28. Raleigh, 584.
29. Ibid, 499.
30. Vol. IX, 314. It is curious that the vital word 'office' is omitted in the passage as quoted by Keith (I. 273).
31. Vol. IX, 786–7.
32. Cf. Vol. IX, p. 789.
32a. Cf. Hamilton's Letters to Elgin dated 16 September, 1897 and 12 November, 1896, quoted on p. 385.
32b. *CR.* April, 1954, pp. 40, 50, 51.
33. Raleigh, 143.
33a. Vol. IX, 786–7. Cf. Hamilton's letter quoted on p. 385.
34. Raleigh, 145.
35. Raleigh, 146.
36. Cf. Vol. IX, pp. 1153-4 for the statistics given by Gokhale.
37. Raleigh, 589.
38. See above, pp. 366–9.
39. Raleigh, 163.
40. Ronaldshay, II. 326-7.
40a. *Speeches*, pp. 1091 ff.
41. See p. 401; also Vol. IX. 786-7.
42. Chirol-I, 102.
42a. Blunt-II, 158.
42b. Morley, *Recollections*, II. 265, 231, 214.
43. Vol. IX, pp. 1157 ff.
44. The British policy towards the Indian National Congress has been fully discussed in Ch. XV, section II, which really forms a supplement to this chapter.
44a. *MR*, VIII. 463-4.
44b. Ibid, 464.
45. Banerji, S.N., *A Nation in Making*, p. 152.
46. Chailley, p. 166.
47. William Jennings Bryan, *British Rule in India* (1915), pp. 8, 13.

CHAPTER XI (XLIX)

THE ATTITUDE OF INDIANS TOWARDS BRITISH RULE

It has been related above, how the Hindus in Bengal acclaimed the establishment of British rule as a divine dispensation for their deliverance from the tyrannies of Muslim rule. Leaders like Raja Rammohan Roy, Dwaraka-nath Tagore, Prasanna-kumar Tagore and others gave public expression to this view, and some of them even went so far as to assert that they preferred the British rule to the rule by the Hindus themselves. The Muslims also accepted the British rule, in sullen resentment but without any active protest. The same thing was more or less true of the other parts of India, and so far as evidence goes, there was no general reaction to British rule anywhere in the British dominions in India.

The attitude of the Hindus towards the British and their rule in India was, however, gradually changed. The early enthusiasm over the blessings of the British rule became cold as the memory of the anarchy and confusion preceding it and the evils of Muslim rule faded more and more from living memory. It is almost a universal truth that there is no gratitude in politics. This applies as much to individuals as to nations. The crowned hero of the people soon passes out of public memory, even if a worse fate does not befall him. For, the people easily forget the benefits they owe to him, and merely remember his lapse or failure to keep abreast with the progressive ideas. So was it with the Indians *vis à vis* the British rule. They fully recognized the immense good that the British had conferred upon India, but general opinion gradually lost sight of it, and discontent and disaffection at the failure to obtain what they had a right to expect, proved a far more potent force than the gratification which they had felt or should still have felt for what they had already gained. It is useless to discuss in this context whether the benefits of British rule did or did not exceed its evils, for, the people are never in a mood to consider such a question in a calm and dispassionate manner. The resentment at immediate and visible wrongs always stirs the human feelings more deeply than, and out of all proportions to, the generous impulses invoked by acts of benevolence which are either too remote or do not lie on the surface.

Among the wrongs which caused the repulsion of Indian feelings against the Englishmen and their rule in India, the foremost place should be given to the deeds actuated by racial arrogance, referred to in Ch. IX. Numerous instances have been quoted there of the insult and humiliations suffered by Indians in daily life, and not infrequent assaults and bursting of Indian spleens by European kicks. The farce of criminal trial which usually let off the English offender, and the hue and cry raised by the entire Anglo-Indian community even if a very nominal penalty was imposed, left no doubt that the offence was neither exceptional nor of an individual character, but was the product of racial arrogance. These incidents, unfortunately only too common, rankled in the minds of Indians of all classes, and their utter helplessness to retaliate made the feeling more bitter and poignant. Little did the British realize, or do even now recognize, the profound nature of the discontent and disaffection caused by these individual acts and the support given to them by the whole community. They had no eyes to see how they struck at the very foundations of the loyalty and good will of the Indians to the Englishmen and their rule. It would be hardly any exaggeration to say that these incidents of assault and affronts, and the immunity from due punishment enjoyed by their perpetrators, did far more to kindle the fire of animosity against the British and their political authority than even graver abuses of their administration and economic exploitation.

Reference has been made to these administrative abuses in detail in the preceding chapters (Vol. IX) specially dealing with these topics. It will suffice here to refer to some general features. The grievance which wounded most the feeling and susceptibilities of the English-educated Indians was the deliberate policy to rule India mainly for the interest of England, and to keep out the Indians from their legitimate share in the administration of their own country. In both these respects they offered a most unfavourable contrast to the preceding Muslim rule; and they formed the principal complaint against the British, and called forth the most persistent demands for reform, throughout the nineteenth century. Even when a competitive examination was introduced for selecting candidates for superior services, the lowering of the maximum age, manipulation of subjects for examinations, and refusal to hold a simultaneous examination in India—all to the extreme disadvantage of an Indian candidate—merely underlined the policy of the British authorities to keep out the Indians as much as possible from the key-posts in the administration.

The Indians pointed out that though the competitive examination was theoretically open to all, the holding of the examination in England alone proved to be a great handicap for Indian students. For, apart from the expenses of journey to England which few could afford, the orthodox Hindu objection to sea-voyage, and the natural reluctance of Indian parents to send their children to such a distant place and strange social environment, created special difficulties. Liberal-minded Englishmen like John Bright fully shared the feeling of the Indians. When the British politicians argued in self-defence that no one was excluded from the competitive examination on racial considerations, Bright humorously retorted: "They might as well say that conditions were absolutely equal as between Englishmen and Indians, only the Indian competitors must be 8ft. 6 inches in height." Indeed the justice of the Indian case was so obvious that even the British House of Commons once passed the resolution of a private member in favour of introducing simultaneous examinations. But the Cabinet never gave effect to it.[1]

To the English-educated Indians who formed the chief pillars of support to the British rule, their virtual exclusion from the higher branches of administration on purely racial grounds (as they conceived it), proved to be the rudest shock, particularly as they had nurtured the fond hope that the Englishmen would never hesitate to offer higher posts to qualified Indians. It is, therefore, not difficult to understand why this Civil Service question, for the first time, brought the whole of educated Indians on a common political platform against the English, as will be related in Ch. XIV.

The British rulers showed the same mentality in their persistent refusal to admit suitable and representative Indians to the Legislative Councils, the demand for which was reiterated throughout the century. The principles laid down in Lord Durham's Report in 1839, advocating Responsible Government in Canada, and the speeches of the liberal statesmen like Cobden when this measure was under consideration of the House of Commons, had naturally roused expectation in the minds of the Indians that their case would receive an equally fair and favourable consideration. Similar liberal policy towards Australia in 1850 and South Africa in 1854 had further strengthened this belief. There is hardly any doubt that the hope of securing similar liberal treatment from the British Government induced the English-educated Indians to hold aloof from the great outbreak of 1857. Their hopes were not belied. Even after the dark days of the Mutiny the gracious English Queen, while taking over the reins of Indian Government in her own hands, made a solemn promise to treat her Indian subjects on exactly the same footing as her other subjects. In particular she declared that all her subjects, irrespective of race or creed, shall be freely and impartially admitted into Government service.

This was rightly regarded as the Magna Carta of political rights by the Indians. Unfortunately, as years rolled by, the Indians felt that it was as deceptive as the Charter Act of 1833, and that their claims for political advancement would never be conceded. There was a gradual change in the views of the authorities in England, and the Indians were not slow to recognise it.

Some concessions were made by the Acts of 1861 and 1892, but, as noted above, they fell far short, not only of Indian demand, but also of what the island of Ceylon had been granted years before. The Moderate party in Indian politics had pinned their faith on the British sense of justice and fondly entertained the hope that once the British people were convinced of the justice of Indian cause they would not hesitate to grant the necessary reforms. But hope deferred maketh the heart sick. The fate of the Congress resolutions passed year after year chilled even the most robust optimism. Though some incurable optimists still continued to hope, a section of Indians, gradually increasing in number towards the end of the nineteenth century, ceased to hope any longer and looked for other ways of fulfilling their political aspirations. The British tardiness in granting political reforms gave a death-blow to that school of Indian politics which was genuinely attached to the British, and never lost faith in ultimately gaining self-government for India with their consent and co-operation. A new school took its place, guided by a firm conviction that the British must be forced to grant what they denied to simple justice, and this view was shared by a steadily increasing number of Indians.

Besides racial arrogance and the deliberate policy to keep out the Indians from a legitimate share in the administration of their own country, there were other factors at work to alienate them from their rulers. That India was administered for the interest of England alone was nowhere more clearly manifest than in the British economic policy.

The grinding poverty of the Indians was a cause of grave concern and profound discontentment to the educated Indians. Reference has been made in earlier chapters to the ruin of flourishing Indian trade and industry brought about by the unfair use of political authority by the East India Company and their servants, the misery of the cultivators on account of the oppressive land-rent, the huge drain of wealth from India caused by the cost of maintaining English civil and military officials, and various other factors, the effect of which was the impoverishment of the country more and more. It assumed serious proportions and drew the attention of English-educated Indians. Dadabhai Naoroji was the first eminent

Indian leader to devote his attention to this subject, and bring home to the people, both in India and England, the abject poverty of the Indians by quoting facts and figures. At the same time he traced the poverty to its root causes, boldly exposed the evil effects of the administration of India by foreigners, and suggested remedial measures. Dadabhai made a scientific study of the economic aspect of foreign rule and carried on a vigorous propaganda, throughout his life, against the economic exploitation of India by England. He patiently collected the relevant data, and his formidable array of facts and unassailable arguments created a profound impression among his own countrymen, and even among a section of Englishmen. To him belongs the credit of rousing the political consciousness of India to this great menace of foreign rule, and henceforth it formed a chief plank in the constitutional agitation of India against British rule. The economic question was later taken up by other eminent men, notably William Digby and R. C. Dutt, and has always loomed large in the political relations between England and India.

In a paper read before the East India Association on July 27, 1870, Dadabhai concluded, after an elaborate calculation of all available data, that the average annual income of the population of British India was 40 shillings per head. It was merely the first step in his memorable investigation and exposition of the difficult problem. In this paper, and in subsequent writings, he drew prominent attention to several important facts. The lack of proper supervision over expenditure by the Indian Government was a crying evil. As a prominent English official complained, "they care no more about spending a crore of Rupees than we do a lac." Part of the difficulty in the financial administration of India was also due to the fact that the Indian Chancellor of the Exchequer had to serve two masters, the Local Government and the Home Government, and as the latter had the last word in the matter, the interest of India had on many occasions to be sacrificed to the interest of England. Another serious evil was the costliness of the administration caused by "lavishness in respect of salaries and leave-allowances, immense gathering of civil and military officers from all parts of India at the hill-stations during nearly half the year, and the ever-growing military expenditure which nearly absorbed a third of the gross revenue." The military expenditure of India "was more than the ordinary military expenditure of the great military monarchies of Europe, more even than the expenditure by which England maintained the security not only of the country, but also of the whole of the British colonies, including Canada. Even the Controller-General of military expenditure had remarked that military history presented 'no instance of any army so constituted, or of one so costly."[1a]

The inevitable result of the costly administration and inefficient financial supervision was heavy taxation which specially fell upon the poorer classes. Dadabhai maintained that the burden of taxation on the cultivator was not equitable when compared with the burden borne by other classes. Nor was he satisfied that the machinery for the collection of the land revenue was economical.

Dadabhai pointed out that "the total production of the country is admitted to be 40s. per head....so that living from hand to mouth, and that on 'scanty subsistence' (in the words of Lord Lawrence), the very touch of famine carries away hundreds of thousands." "Is not this in itself," asked he, "as 'crushing' to any people as it can possibly be? And yet out of this wretched income they have to pay taxation as well." Then he introduced his theory of 'drain.'

"Whatever revenue is raised by the other countries, for instance, the £70,000,000 by England, the whole of it returns back to the people and remains in the country; and therefore the national capital, upon which the production of a country depends, does not suffer diminution; while, on account of India being subject to a foreign rule, out of £50,000,000 of revenue raised every year, some £12,000,000 or more are carried away to England, and the national capital—or, in other words, its capability of production—is continually diminished year after year."[2]

In 1876 Dadabhai read a paper on the poverty of India before a crowded meeting held under the auspices of the Bombay Branch of the East India Association. Two years later, the paper was published in London in the form of a pamphlet—a prelude to the bulky volume that was to follow a quarter of a century later under the title, *Poverty and Un-British Rule in India.*

Dadabhai produced facts and figures and cited authorities for his statement that India was sinking more and more in poverty, and that the system of administration of the country was largely responsible for her misery.

"After elaborate calculations, Dadabhai said he had clearly established that the value of the production of one of the best provinces in India was Rs. 20 per head per annum. The conclusion was that even for such food and clothing as a criminal (in jail) obtains, there was hardly enough production even in a good season, 'leaving alone all little luxuries, all social and religious wants, all expenses on occasions of joy and sorrow, and provision for a bad season."[3]

Next came under review statistics of imports and exports. From 1835 to 1872 India imported goods worth only about £ 943,000,000 against exports valued at £ 1,430,000,000, leaving a balance of about £ 500,000,000, as the total tribute which India annually paid to England. Had interest been calculated, the drain would have amounted to a higher figure. Dadabhai then quoted statements made by British officials to establish his main contention that most of the ills of India were due to the heavy tribute which she had to pay to England. For example, one of the Commissioners of Revenue in the Deccan, "who afterwards became a member of Council, Saville Marriot, had stated in a letter written in the year 1836 that India had been 'verging to the lowest ebb of pauperism', and that it would be 'difficult to satisfy the mind that any country could bear such a drain upon its resources without sustaining very serious injury."[4]

Another important question raised was that of protection. Instructions had been then issued by the Secretary of State for the abolition of the duties on cotton.[5] The real object, said Dadabhai, was to smother the infant factories in India, the ostensible reason being free trade. He then added:

> "Now I do not want to say anything about the real selfish objects of the Manchesterians, or what the political necessities of a Conservative Government may be under Manchester pressure. I give credit to the Secretary of State for honesty of purpose, and take the reason itself that is given on this question, viz., free trade. I like free trade, but after what I have said to-night, you will easily see that free trade between England and India in a matter like this is something like a race between a starving, exhausted invalid, and a strong man with a horse to ride on. Free trade between countries which have equal command over their own resources is one thing; but even then the colonies snapped their fingers at all such talk. But what can India do? Before powerful English interests, India must and does go to the wall. Young colonies, says Mill, need protection. India needs it in a far larger degree, independent of the needs of revenue which alone have compelled the retention of the present duties. Let India have its present drain brought within reasonable limits, and India will be quite prepared for free trade. With a pressure of taxation nearly double in proportion to that of England, from an income of one fifteenth, and an exhaustive drain besides, we are asked to compete with England in free trade."[6]

It is not necessary to discuss at length the accuracy of Dadabhai's facts and figures and the soundness of his views on economic questions mentioned above. They have been substantially corroborated by R. C. Dutt, Digby and other distinguished writers on the subject at a later date, and have not been seriously upset even by hostile critics. But the real importance of Dadabhai's contribution lies in the deep impression it made upon the educated Indians about the seriousness of the economic condition in India and its close relation to politics. The contemporary periodical literature in India leaves no doubt that Dadabhai's views found an echo in the hearts of Indians of all classes and shades of opinion.

Lord George Hamilton, Secretary of State for India in Lord Salisbury's Cabinet, referred in his Budget speech to "a small school in this country as well as in India who are perpetually asserting that our rule is bleeding India to death." "I admit at once", said he, "that if it could be shown that India has retrograded in material prosperity under our rule we stand self-condemned, and we ought no longer to be entrusted with the control of that country." But, he added, that in spite of the most careful study of facts and figures he could not find any justification for the view. It was pointed out by Digby in reply, that one of the earliest members of the "small school" was no other than the Prime Minister Lord Salisbury himself under whom Lord George Hamilton served. In 1875 Salisbury, as Secretary of State for India, urged that "as India must be bled, the bleeding should be done judiciously." He also admitted that "much of the revenue of India is exported without a direct equivalent."[7]

Digby held, after an elaborate calculation, based wholly on official data, that the drain of capital from India during the nineteenth century amounted to £6,080,172,021. He pointed out that "about five weeks' average maintenance of each Indian outside the one million well-to-do folks is annually disbursed in Great Britain, one of the wealthiest of lands, while the disbursing country is, omitting none, the poorest realm in all the world!"[8] The views of R. C. Dutt have been quoted above.[8a] Sir George Campbell, by no means a friend of India, also calculated that the annual remittances, both public and private, from India to England amounted to more than 32 million sterling.[9] Digby also pointed out that the non-official estimated average national income of an Indian was 2d. per head per day in 1850. The official estimate in 1882 was 1½d. per day. According to his analysis of all sources the income was less than ¾d. per day in 1900.

In reply to the criticism of some Englishmen that Dadabhai's statements had "a possible seditious and mischievous tendency," Dadabhai said that "no native from one end of India to the other could be found more loyal than I am to the British rule; because it is my sincere conviction, which I have expressed often, that the salvation of India, its future prosperity, its civilization, and its political elevation, all depend on the continuance of the British rule. It is because I wish that the British rule should be long continued in India, and that it is good that the rulers should know native feeling and opinions, that I come forward and speak my mind freely and boldly."[10]

There was a wave of discontent and indignation all over the country when, early in 1879, the import duties on cotton goods were abolished. Though discussed above[11] in some detail, it is necessary to recapitulate it briefly. The import duty which stood at 10% in 1860, was gradually reduced to 5% in 1875. Even this was resented by cotton manufacturers of Lancashire. Strong pressure was brought to bear upon Lord Northbrook by the ministry at home, but he stoutly refused to do away with the import duty. He rightly pointed out that the duty was levied not for protection of Indian industry, but for revenue purposes, that its abolition would mean new taxation, and that it was politically unwise to have the appearance of sacrificing the interests of India to those of Manchester. Northbrook won the day. But the continuous agitation of Lancashire induced the House of Commons to pass a resolution in 1877 that the duties ought to be repealed without delay as soon as the financial condition of India would permit. In 1878 and 1879 the duties were abolished on all cotton goods except those manufactured from finer counts of 30s. and upwards.

The majority of the members of Lord Lytton's Executive Council were opposed to this repeal. Lord Lytton passed the measure under the power given by law to the Governor-General to act on his own opinion alone, "whenever the safety, tranquillity or interests of the British possessions in India may in his judgment be essentially affected." Lord Lytton's use of the prerogative on this occasion was highly unconstitutional and was severely criticised even in the House of Commons.

Lord Lytton's action aroused bitter opposition among the Indians, and indignant protests were made all over the country. A public meeting, held in Bombay on May 3, 1879, decided to send a petition to the House of Commons. The memorial, ably drawn up, was forwarded to Mr. Fawcett, the indefatigable 'member for India', for submission to the House of Commons. The result was, of course, a foregone conclusion. It was unceremoniously rejected by the House. "Thus did British statesmen discharge their 'sacred trust', and thus were £ 200,000 of India's revenue shamelessly bartered away to win over the Lancashire votes for party purposes at Home."

This incident demonstrated, as nothing else could, that India was governed in the interest of Britain, and provoked, beyond measure, Indians of all shades of opinion. The press denounced the action of Lord Lytton in the most vigorous language, and hundreds of public meetings and newspaper articles brought home to the minds of the Indians two important lessons, namely, that the British were out to plunder India without let or hindrance, and kill the infant cotton industry in India in order to remove a possible rival in future. These two lessons were never lost upon the Indians. They never forgot that these formed the basic policy of the English, nor forgave those who were responsible for it. Unable to devise any other means to give vent to their rage, and in an exasperated mood of frustration, some papers urged upon the Indians to make a firm resolve not to use Manchester piece-goods, thus forestalling by a quarter of a century the boycott movement in Bengal in 1905.

The masses did not seriously concern themselves with questions of high policy, political or economic, and were not very much affected by the newly born urge of nationalism or patriotism, which moved the English-educated classes. Nevertheless, they were gradually alienated from the British rule by the terrible miseries which they had to suffer from one end of the year to the other. As the large majority of the people were cultivators or labourers, it is necessary to refer briefly to them in order to understand the Indian attitude towards the British rule.

The condition of the cultivators grew from bad to worse, and famine became a periodically recurring disaster. R. C. Dutt, a retired Indian Civilian, ruthlessly exposed the real causes of the repeated occurrence of this calamity all over India. These were mainly the heavy land revenue and the oppressive manner in which it was realized, the ruin of trade and industry, and the huge drain of wealth to England, to which reference has been made above. "The great famines of 1837, 1857, 1877 and 1897 are sad landmarks in the modern history of India—landmarks not of progress and prosperity but of desolation and disasters." The growing character of this great evil will be apparent from the fact that while there were seven famines with an estimated total of one and a half million deaths in the first half of the nineteenth century, there were twenty-four famines with an estimated total of over twenty million deaths in the second half.[12]

As mentioned above, there were serious agrarian disturbances in Bengal in 1872-73 where the tenants openly called themselves 'rebels' and launched something like a no-rent campaign. The administration reports of the Bengal Government during 1872-75 admitted that the "ryots of Eastern Bengal have learnt to unite for common action", "that there seems to be a disposition among the ryots to combine in something like leagues and unions," and regarded the consequences as 'serious'.

Agrarian discontent reached its climax in Western India about the time when the Prince of Wales (later, Edward VII) visited India in 1875. It assumed serious proportions and produced violent anti-British feeling and national sentiment. Two Zamindars in a village were sentenced to capital punishment for brutally killing a revenue officer. One of them, just before going to the scaffold, requested the officer that a volley of muskets should be fired over his dead body. He held that by killing the oppressive revenue officer he had done a public duty and patriotic deed. He therefore wished that there should be some recognition of the fact that he sacrificed his life for the cause of his country.[13]

The cruelties perpetrated by European indigo- and tea-planters have become almost a by-word for iniquity of British rule during the period under review. The harrowing tales of misery and oppression, committed with impunity, and with the connivance, if not active support, of the officials, have been told above.[14] Nearly throughout the nineteenth century these woeful stories were spread from mouth to mouth, and through periodical literature, and created a strong hatred against the British in popular minds. Unable to bear their oppression the cultivators of indigo were forced to launch a *Satyagraha* or civil resistance, anticipating Mahatma Gandhi's action by sixty years. The Coolies in the tea-garden bore in silence the kicks and blows of the white planters till 'the bursting up of their spleens' relieved them of their earthly miseries. But the stories of the 'Indian Negro-slaves' kindled fire of indigination in every Indian heart.[15]

The Indians also smarted under other grievances which, they believed, were due to errors of omission or commission on the part of the foreign Government. The imposition of new taxes, particularly on necessaries of life, was strongly resented, as the people believed, rightly or wrongly, that these could be largely avoided by curtailing unnecessary and wasteful expenditure. To saddle the poor Indian exchequer with the heavy expenses of imperial wars in Burma, Afghanistan and Abyssinia was particularly assailed in this context. Steady rise in the prices of foodstuffs hit the people hard, and frequent famines decimated the land; the people attributed them solely to the selfish economic policy deliberately pursued by the British. The favouritism shown to the Englishmen as against Indians in all walks of life was another sore point with the Indians. Particularly galling were the supersession of the claims of Indians in favour of Englishmen of distinctly lower qualification in Government services; virtual exclusion of Indians from the higher Civil and Military services, and such other superior services as Police, Education, and Medical; undue advantages extended to English business men even to the detriment of Indian interest; and, above all, the almost criminal partiality of English officers—magistrates, judges, policemen—and jurors to Englishmen.

The neglect of primary education causing appalling illiteracy, failure to provide for higher technical education in order to fit Indians for industry and business, prompted by the ignoble motive of keeping India as a perpetual market for English trade, restrictions imposed on Indians by the Arms Act and the Vernacular Press Act, the corruption and inefficiency of the police,—all these were heavy counts in popular minds against the British Government.

It is irrelevant to discuss in this context whether some of these charges were not either imaginary or unduly exaggerated. There is no doubt whatsoever about the fact that they were believed, almost universally, by all classes of Indians. For, when the people are perpetually deprived of all share and responsibility in the administration, they are prone to believe that all the ills they suffer are due to the faults of the Government. They may even be excused for highly exaggerating these faults, for those who have no opportunity or even expectation of shouldering the responsibility of Government are hardly likely to consider, in a calm and dispassionate spirit, the difficulties with which the Government had to grapple or to realize that some of the evils are inherent in the system and inevitable under any Government.

Thus when the nineteenth century was drawing to its close, the British almost entirely forfeited the large fund of goodwill with which they had started at the beginning of the century. Discontent and disaffection pervaded all classes and ranks. Constant brooding over the various grievances and grounds of complaint mentioned above, accompanied by a feeling of utter helplessness to stem the tide of repression and injustice, against Englishmen and their administration in India highly exacerbated the Indian feeling. Quickened by the newly awakened spirit of nationalism, the Indians gradually developed a mentality which was decidedly anti-British and differed fundamentally from that which spurred on the older generation with a buoyant faith in English sense of justice. The Moderate party, representing the older generation, was still at the helm of Indian politics, but as they failed to deliver the goods, their leadership was fast slipping away into the grasp of others, who more faithfully reflected the new temperament of the people. These had no faith in the British justice or generosity and were not in a mood to regard the policy of mendicancy, hitherto pursued, as either fruitful or in keeping with the national dignity. Thus a new school of politics silently took the place of the old, and backed by the nation at large, was destined ere long gradually to oust it altogether. But as yet neither the Government nor the people fully realized the great transformation that was silently taking place in India at the turn of the century. At the close of the period under review Surendra-nath Banerji, Pherozeshah Mehta, and G. K. Gokhale were still the acknowledged political leaders of the country; B. G. Tilak, B. C. Pal and Lajpat Rai did not yet count for much in active politics, and Arabinda Ghosh was almost an unknown figure. But those who had ears could hear the cry rising from the heart of the nation, "ring out the old and ring in the new". In less than two years' time the table was turned, and before the first decade of this century was over, 'the old order had changed yielding place to the new.' That story will be told in the next volume.

---

1. Vol. IX, pp. 790-1.
1a. Masani, *Dadabhai,* pp. 123 ff.
2. Ibid, 128-9.
3. Ibid, 189-90.
4. Ibid.
5. Vol. IX, pp. 800 ff.
6. Masani, p. 192.
7. Digby, p. 2. The exact words used by Lord Salisbury in a Minute recorded in 1875 are as follows: "It is not in itself a thrifty policy to draw the mass of revenue from rural districts, where capital is scarce, sparing the towns where it is often redundant and runs to waste in luxury. The injury is exaggerated in the case of India where so much of the revenue is exported without a direct equivalent. As India must be bled, the lancet should be directed to the parts where the blood is congested, or at least sufficient, not to those which are already feeble from the want of it." (quoted in Dutt-II, pp. xii-xiii).
8. Digby, p. 220.
8a. Cf. Vol. IX, pp. 1150 ff.
9. Digby, p. 231.
10. Masani, pp. 124-25.
11. Vol. IX, pp. 802 ff.
12. Vol, IX, pp. 836-7.
13. The *Times of India,* 17 August, 1876.
14. Vol. IX, pp. 914-37.
15. This has been discussed in detail in Chapter XVII, Section I

CHAPTER XII (L)

GROWTH OF POLITICAL IDEAS AND POLITICAL ORGANIZATIONS (UP TO 1858)

I. INTRODUCTION

The most outstanding effect of the introduction of Western culture in India was the growth of modern political concepts, such as nationalism, nationality, patriotism, political rights, etc., which are usually associated with western countries in modern age. Whether and how far these ideas existed in India in ancient and medieval times need not be discussed here. The history of these times in the preceding volumes contains fruitful materials for such a discussion. But certain it is that at the beginning of the period under review these ideas were almost conspicuous by their absence. The political theories of the Hindus did not extend beyond the stage which it reached in A.D. 1200-1300, and the stereotyped ideas of the Muslim rulers, based on the *Qur'ān,* had no prospect of being developed to any extent. Such natural instincts as not unoften take the place of formulated ideas of patriotism and nationalism perhaps existed, to a certain degree, in certain localities. But by the beginning of the nineteenth century even these rudimentary ideas almost totally disappeared from India.

It is idle to expect the growth of patriotism or nationalism in the true sense of the word in those parts of India where the rulers were Muslims but a vast majority of the people were Hindus. The ruling clan might have a sort of national feeling, based on the community of religion, particularly the brotherhood of Islām. But in actual history no such instances are known. Neither in Delhi nor in Bengal, where the Muslims were numerically strong, we come across any evidence of political solidarity among the Muslims strong enough to induce them to make a common stand against the outside invaders. The only example of an organised unity among them is afforded by the Wahabis, but its outlook was strictly communal and religious, and it never played any important role in the general political development of India. Among the Hindus, the Rajputs and the Marathas were noted for their ardent patriotism, but it was too narrow and local in the first case, and merely centred round personalities in the second. Each petty Rajput State constituted a world by itself to its people, and whatever patriotic and national feelings they possessed in the nineteenth century never extended beyond its boundary. The Marathas lost their wider outlook, if ever they had any, and their allegiance was now to the Peshwa and the Bhonsle, and to a lesser degree to Sindhia, Holkar, and Gaekwar (whose subjects were mostly non-Maratha), rather than to any common country or to any common political ideal.

The process by which a body of British merchants gradually made themselves masters of India affords the best evidence, if such evidence were needed, of the utter lack of any sense of patriotism and nationalism in India. The Indian ruling chiefs, even those belonging to the same community, helped the British against one another. The Nizam and the Marathas joined the British against Hyder Ali and Tipu Sultan of Mysore. The Peshwa joined the British against the other Maratha leaders. The Marathas felt no scruple in crushing the Rajputs, and fighting the Sikhs; the Muslim rulers and chiefs fought among themselves; the Marathas were fighting among themselves and against Muslim rulers; and all these went on when the British were consolidating their power and were well on the way to conquer the whole of the country. So it is hardly any exaggeration to say that, politically speaking, there was no India at the beginning of the nineteenth century—it was a mere congeries of States.

Analogy is usually drawn between India on the one hand, and such contemporary European States as Germany and Italy on the other. But this is only partially true. Like India both these countries lacked political unity, and were more or less mere geographical expressions. But as Seeley has rightly pointed out, India's condition was still more degrading in one respect.[1] Napoleon was able to set one German State against another, but he did not make the attempt to raise an army of Germans simply by offering pay, and then use them in the conquest of Germany. It is very doubtful if such an attempt would have been successful. But this is precisely what the British did in India, and with conspicuous success. They conquered the south with the Tilinga troops and the whole of North India with the sepoys recruited from all over that country. They defeated the Sikhs and the Gurkhas with the help of the sepoys, and suppressed the sepoy revolt in 1857 with the help of the Sikhs, Gurkhas and sepoys. Referring to the conquest of India by the East India Company an eminent English historian has aptly remarked that "India can hardly be said to have been conquered at all by foreigners. She has rather conquered herself."

The facts stated above leave no doubt that at the beginning of the nineteenth century, and for at least a century before that, there was no India in the political sense. Neither the chiefs nor the common man had any sense of national unity or even a national feeling in a narrow regional sense. Because there was no India, therefore, properly speaking, there was no foreigner, and people of India entertained no hostile feelings against the English merely as foreigners.

Confirmation and illustration of what has been stated above meet us at almost every step in the early history of the British in Madras and Bengal, the two provinces where they first established a complete political authority. It must therefore strike one as very strange that it was in Bengal that the modern idea of nationalism had its birth in the nineteenth century. The fact is that it germinated in the soil of Bengal, was fertilized by Western education, and then spread rapidly to other parts of India.

It is unnecessary for our present purpose to discuss at length what constitutes the essential elements of nationality, and how far these were present in India or even in its separate provinces in the eighteenth century. The basis of nationality is usually regarded to be one or more of the following: the community of race, language, religion or culture; geographical position; identity of present political interests or past historical traditions, etc. How far all or any of these should be regarded as essential ingredients of nationality, and the extent to which they were present in India are subjects of keen dispute. But there is one element which seems to be a *sine qua non* for constituting a nationality. This has been explained by Mill in the following words:

"A portion of mankind may be said to constitute a nationality if they are united among themselves by common sympathies which do not exist between them and any others—which make them co-operate with each other more willingly than with other people, desire to be under the same government, and desire that it should be governed by themselves or a portion of themselves exclusively."[2]

Such a feeling may be due to a variety of reasons, particularly those that have been referred to above as the basic factors of nationality. But, so long as this feeling does not inspire a considerable body of men, they can hardly be said to form a nation even though they may possess many other essential elements of nationality. Judged by this standard it can be at once said that there was no sense of nationality in Bengal, and far less in India as a whole.

The ideas of nationality and patriotism, on an all-India basis, and political consciousness, leading to struggle for freedom or an urge towards political advancement of the people, cannot be traced before the British period. Even in Europe these ideas were not fully developed, save in England, before the eighteenth century. The American War of Independence and the French Revolution, both in the latter half of that century, gave these ideas a prominence which they have maintained ever since, and shaped the destinies of mankind all over the world. It is a happy coincidence that India's first contact with the West dated precisely from the period when the ideas of nationality, freedom, and democracy exercised the greatest influence in that part of the world and permeated the English literature through which that contact was mainly established. The result was remarkable. Indians with English education were imbued with the most advanced political and social ideas of the West, and though their number was few, their influence was considerable and far-reaching.

II. BENGAL

As in many other fields, so in the demand for political rights also, Raja Rammohan Roy took a leading part and set an example to others. He had a passionate love of liberty which "made him take interest in and deeply sympathise with all political movements all over the world that had for their object the advancement of popular freedom."[3] His cosmopolitan sympathy in the domain of politics is well illustrated by several incidents. When the political aspirations of the people of Naples were crushed by the Holy Alliance in 1821, the Raja was so depressed by the news that he cancelled an engagement for the evening with Mr. Buckingham and wrote to him: "From the late unhappy news I am obliged to conclude that I shall not live to see liberty universally restored to the nations of Europe, and Asiatic nations, especially those that are European colonies, possessed of a greater degree of the same blessing than what they now enjoy". The letter concludes with the remarkable sentence: "Enemies to liberty and friends of despotism have never been and never will be ultimately successful".[4] The Raja also gave a public dinner at the Town Hall in Calcutta on the establishment of constitutional Government in Spain. During his voyage to England, though suffering from some injuries in his leg, he insisted on visiting two French frigates which were flying the tri-colour flag.[5]

A passionate yearning for liberty and an ardent sense of patriotism were instilled into the minds of the students of Hindu College, Calcutta, by its young and gifted teacher, Henry Louis Vivian Derozio, an East Indian (equivalent to Eurasian or Anglo-Indian of the present day) of Portuguese-Indian ancestry. Born in 1808, he was educated in a private school in Calcutta by the Scotsman, Drummond, a 'notorious' free-thinker and an exile from his native land,

and was inspired by him with those radical ideas about politics, society, and religion which he communicated to his own students. Derozio was appointed a teacher to the senior classes in the Hindu College shortly before 13 May, 1826, before probably he had even completed his eighteenth year. The biographer of Derozio has justly observed that "neither before, nor since his day, has any teacher, within the walls of any native educational establishment in India, ever exercised such an influence over his pupils". Derozio had unflinching faith in the French Revolution and English Radicalism, and drew the senior boys "like a magnet" around him. Through the medium of academic Associations and College Magazines, Derozio and his pupils discussed such topics as freewill and fate, virtue and vice, patriotism, idolatry, priestcraft, superstitions, and even the existence of God, not to speak of subjects of lesser importance like female education, cheap justice etc. The practical effect of the political teachings of Derozio may be illustrated by two incidents. "On 10 December, 1830, 200 persons attended the July Revolution celebration in the Town Hall. On Christmas day of the same year the tricolour flag of the French Revolution was hoisted on the monument, and it is not difficult to guess, by whom."

Derozio regarded himself as an Indian and wrote patriotic verses, a specimen of which is given below:

"My country! in the days of glory past
A beauteous halo circled round thy brow,
And worshipped as a deity thou wast,
Where is that glory, where that reverence now?"

Derozio's personality ushered in a new era in the annals of the Hindu College, but for that very reason the orthodox Hindu community strongly disliked him, and at last brought about his dismissal in 1831. Undaunted in any way, Derozio established a daily paper—the *East Indian*—and carried on his activities. But death put an end to his career on December 26, 1831, at the age of 23 years and 8 months.[6]

The dismissal and premature death of Derozio at the age of twenty-three struck a heavy blow at the growth of Young Bengal, for he left behind him ideas but no organization. Many of his pupils cherished to the last days of their lives the rational spirit and radical views in politics which they had imbibed from him, but being scattered about in various professions and pre-occupations, their activities did not lead to any permanent school of thought in politics. Nevertheless, it was no small gain that a large number of distinguished students of the Hindu College carried on the spirit of Derozio for many years to come, and, generally speaking, the Hindu College students became familiar with the most radical political ideas then prevalent in Europe.[6a] They carefully studied the history and revolutionary philosophy of France and were deeply stirred by the wave of Revolutions in Europe in 1830. That some of them even looked forward to the outbreak of a similar revolution in India may be gathered from a series of essays on the grievances of India published in the *Bengal Harkaru* of 1843. A deep patriotic feeling inspired a number of poems written about 1830 by Kashi-prasad Ghosh, a student of the Hindu College. In one of these he sang the glory of the motherland as follows:

"Land of the gods and lofty name;
Land of the fair and beauty's spell;
Land of the bards of mighty fame,
My native land! for e'er farewell!"

It has been justly remarked that "this song might be taken as the first cry of patriotic fervour, which was roused in Bengal by the introduction of Western culture."

But while the students of the Hindu College dreamt of independence, they were the first to recognize that it would take long in coming. This sentiment is beautifully expressed in the following verse by Kashi-prasad:

"But woe me! I shall never live to behold,
That day of thy triumph, when firmly and bold,
Thou shalt mount on the wings of an eagle on high
To the region of knowledge and blest liberty."

This truth was so obvious to one and all that all practical efforts were mainly directed to demands for political reforms. The students of the Hindu College propagated the ideas through their associations and periodical publications, as already noted above. But more active efforts were made by the new leaders by demanding specific reforms.

The general attitude of the educated classes towards the British Government is reflected in the following observations of Raja Rammohan Roy in his 'Appeal to the King in Council' against the Press Regulation:

"Your Majesty is aware, that under their former Muhammadan Rulers, the natives of this country enjoyed every political privilege in common with Mussulmans, being eligible to the highest offices in the state........ Although under the British Rule, the natives of India have entirely lost this political consequence, your Majesty's faithful subjects were consoled by the more secure enjoyment of those civil and religious rights which had been so often violated by the rapacity and intolerance of the Mussulmans; and notwithstanding the loss of political rank and power, they considered themselves much happier in the enjoyment of civil and religious liberty than were their ancestors; but if these rights that remain are allowed to be unceremoniously invaded .... the basis on which they have founded their hopes of comfort and happiness under the British Power will be destroyed".[7]

This spirited protest was evoked by the new Press Ordinance of 1823, noted above, which prescribed that no one should publish a newspaper or other periodical without having obtained a license from the Governor-General in Council.[8]

The next measure which strongly agitated the public was the Jury Act of 1827 by which the Christians, including native converts, could not be tried by a Hindu or Musalman juror, but any Hindu or Musalman could be tried by Europeans or native Christians. The Act also denied both to Hindus and Musalmans the honour of a seat in the Grand Jury even in the trial of fellow-Hindus or Musalmans. Petitions against the Act for presentation to both Houses of Parliament were signed by Hindus and Musalmans. Raja Rammohan Roy, who drew up the petition, made some observations about the future of India, which may be quoted as a remarkable testimony to the advanced political ideas of educated Bengal in 1829.

"Supposing that 100 years hence the Native character becomes elevated from constant intercourse with Europeans and the acquirement of general and political knowledge as well as of modern arts and sciences, is it possible that they will not have the spirit as well as the inclination to resist effectually any unjust and oppressive measures serving to degrade them in the scale of society? It should not be lost sight of that the position of India is very different from that of Ireland, to any quarter of which an English fleet may suddenly convey a body of troops that may force its way in the requisite direction and succeed in suppressing every effort of a refractory spirit. Were India to share one-fourth of the knowledge and energy of that country, she would prove from her remote situation, her riches and her vast population, either useful and profitable as a willing province, an ally of the British empire, or troublesome and annoying as a determined enemy."[9]

An idea of the other measures of reform which were demanded at the time may be gathered from the several communications made by Rammohan to the Board of Control in 1831. These included the fixation of maximum rents to be paid by the cultivator; the substitution of English for Persian as the official language of the courts of law; the appointment of native assessors in the civil courts; trial by jury; Habeas Corpus Act; separation of the offices of judge and revenue commissioners; separation of the offices of judge and magistrate; codification of the criminal law and also of the civil law of India; independence of judges; legal responsibility of officials; consultation with the local magnates before enacting laws; and last, but not the least, the appointment of Indians to higher posts, which were practically reserved for the British.[10]

Some of these measures were advocated by others even before Raja Rammohan Roy.[11] Nevertheless, he may certainly be regarded as the great pioneer of political movement in India.

Rammohan was also the first Indian to voice the grievances of his country before the British authorities. His activities were not altogether unsuccessful. It was generally believed that some of the beneficent provisions in the Charter Act of 1833 were mainly due to his influence.[12] In a memorial meeting for the Raja, held in the Town Hall, Calcutta, on April 5, 1834, Rasik-krishna Mallik said:

> "To his going there (England) we are in a great measure indebted for the best clauses in the new Charter; bad and wretched as the Charter is ..... the few provisions that it contains for the good of our countrymen we owe to Rammohan Roy".[13]

As an important indication of the political advance of the Bengali public it may be noted that the Charter Act of 1833 evoked strong protest both from Indians and Englishmen. At the request of the leading citizens of Calcutta, both Indians and Europeans, the Sheriff called a public meeting at the Town Hall on 5 January, 1835, to protest against the Act. Theodore Dickens, Thomas E.M. Turton, and Rasik-krishna Mallik made eloquent speeches to show that the Act put a burden of insupportable magnitude upon the people of India for the sole benefit of the East India Stock, and was extremely unsatisfactory as it was not likely to improve the administration of the country to any appreciable extent. The meeting urged the repeal of Press Regulations of 1823, and the removal of the restraint upon public meetings. The meeting also took steps to communicate its proceedings to the Government and the British Parliament.

Reference may be made, in connection with political reforms, to a pet idea of Raja Rammohan and his associates which provoked angry discussions in those days. It is the plan of having a European colony in India. The idea was to induce Europeans of upper classes, including capitalists and captains of industry, to settle permanently in India in large numbers. It was advocated mainly on two grounds.

The huge annual flow of money from India to England was discussed in the newspapers and Rammohan calculated the total amount withdrawn from India to England between 1765 and 1820 to be 110 million sterling. With a view to checking such a huge drain of Indian wealth he suggested that the Europeans accumulating capital in India should be encouraged to settle in India so that the wealth might not go out of the country.[14] The second reason was the Raja's firm conviction that these Europeans would, by their superior knowledge and public spirit, bring about the industrial regeneration of India, effect improvement in mechanical arts, teach the people how to secure political rights, and would themselves secure better administration of the country by representing the grievances of India to the authorities in England. "The greater our intercourse with European gentlemen", said the Raja in a public meeting in 1829, "the greater will be our improvement in literary, social and political affairs." The idea was supported by men like Dwaraka-nath Tagore and a petition signed by a number of persons was sent to Parliament in favour of the colonization. It is only fair to add that Rammohan was fully alive to the probable dangers and disadvantages of the scheme.[15]

There was, however, considerable opposition to the idea. A letter published in the Bengali periodical *Samāchāra-darpaṇa* (October 15, 1831) said that "it is not the wish of the great body of the Hindus that the English should come and cultivate the ground and become landlords."[16]

The students of the Hindu College, who supported many of the measures of reform, referred to above, were divided in their opinion on the subject of European colonisation in India. Some supported the scheme, while others vigorously opposed it. A paper containing a very comprehensive review of the whole question was read before the Hindu Literary Society and published in the *India Gazette* (February 12, 1830). The writer traces the history of colonization from the most ancient times, and describes the oppressive character and the adverse effect on the native population of the Greek, Roman, and Phoenician colonies of the ancient, and the English, Dutch, and Spanish colonies of modern times. In a tone of brilliant satire the author observes: "No sooner did the benevolent inhabitants of Europe behold their sad condition, than they immediately go to work to ameliorate and improve it. They introduced among them, *rum, gin, brandy* and other comforts of life, and it is astonishing to read how soon the poor savages learnt to estimate these *blessings*."[17]

This splendid review is remarkable in many ways. It shows the depth of learning, power of expression, capacity of acute judgement, and a spirit of true national feeling, on the part of a youth, which would do credit to any public leader of repute. What is more important, it proves that the teaching in Hindu College did not necessarily denationalize or anglicize the Hindus of Bengal, as is generally supposed. Above all, it shows that the inordinate flow of love for the British which swept the country during the first quarter of the nineteenth century was slowly ebbing away. Rammohan Roy tells us that the enlightened people looked upon the English as deliverers rather than as conquerors, and that the citizens of Calcutta offered prayers for the victory of the British during the third Maratha and the Nepal wars.[18] But while the older generation still retained this spirit of goodwill towards the British, a new generation was slowly growing up with less confidence in the benevolent character of the foreign rule. This is amply proved by the opinions freely expressed by some political writers of the time most of whom were students or ex-students of the College. A few may be quoted as specimens.

Rasik-krishna Mallik (1810-1858), a brilliant student of the Hindu College, and editor of the *Gyananneshun*, severely condemned the Calcutta Police and the administration of justice, which, in his opinion, was characterised by everything that is opposed to the just principles of government. "The primary function of government," said he, "was to administer justice fairly and impartially. But this function can be properly discharged only by such a government as has thoroughly identified itself with the welfare and interest of the governed." According to him this was not the case in India which was governed by a body of merchants whose principal aim as such would be to promote their own interests and who naturally "will try to make their government subservient to the one ignoble principle of gain."[19]

Dakshina-ranjan Mukhopadhyay advocated the doctrine of equality of men and held that God "in his impartial wisdom created all men alike equal to one another in their birth rights."[20] He reiterated the maxim that "governments are for the good of the many, and not the few".[21] As a corollary to all this, he emphasised the evils of subjection to foreigners. In his opinion the foreign rulers were guided by their own interests and were seldom actuated by the philanthropic desire of promoting the welfare of the native races. He attributed the poverty of India to foreign subjection.[22]

As against such radical views, many political leaders, mostly associates of Raja Rammohan Roy, had unflinching faith in the British Government. Thus Prasanna-kumar Tagore wrote: "If we were to be asked, what Government we would prefer, English or any other, we would one and all reply, English by all means, ay, even in preference to a Hindu Government".[23] Dwaraka-nath Tagore also expressed 'his conviction that the happiness of India is best secured by her connection with England.'[24] Girish-chandra Ghosh, the founder and first editor of the *Hindoo Patriot* and the *Bengalee,* held that the educated Indians had not yet become fit for taking the responsibility of their country's administration on their own shoulders, "and that by subverting the British rule,—even if it were in their power so to do,—they would only prepare their necks for another and, perhaps, a heavier foreign yoke."[25]

But in spite of theoretical differences between the younger and older sections about the character and desirability of the British rule, there was a general agreement of views among the political thinkers of the time that there were serious defects in the system of administration. While the younger section vigorously denounced the abuses, mainly taking their stand on the abstract principles of government derived from the radical writers of Europe, the older section believed that they could be remedied by constitutional agitation. They had implicit faith in "the pure and benevolent intentions of the British Government whose noble solicitude for the welfare and improvement of millions committed by Providence to its charge, may challenge the admiration of the wide world".

The main object of these political leaders was to rouse the political consciousness of the people of Bengal in order to bring the pressure of public opinion to bear upon the Government. The apathy of the general people to political affairs constituted their main difficulty. Dwaraka-nath Tagore remarked in a public meeting held on 18 June, 1836: "The majority of my countrymen say, 'If I have lost one eye, let me take care of the other,' and thus they keep themselves back from public meetings and are tardy in the assertion of their rights." But he had great faith that English education would cure this evil. "Let the Hindu College go on," said he, "for three or four years more and you will have a meeting like this attended by four times the number of natives."[26]

Undeterred by the general public apathy, the leaders carried on regular agitation in the press and on the platform. It is not possible to give an adequate account of the specific demands for political reform or the different views on which they were based, and only a brief reference to the important topics must suffice.

The spread of education among the masses was urged as a fundamental duty of the Government. Tara-chand Chakravarty, the leader of Young Bengal, regarded it as an essential function of government which is not only to maintain peace and order but also to lead the citizens to live a better life. "The general elightenment of the people", said he, "is undoubtedly the best guarantee of a good government". "According to Tarachand, power has been delegated to government by the people with a view to 'the protection of rights, the prevention of wrongs and the consequent promotion of happiness'. Such being the origin of government, it is bound 'to consider the education of the people, whom they govern, a part of their duty". He further maintained that this education should not be merely theoretical, but include sound vocational training through government institutions built up on the model of the Polytechnic schools of Paris.[27] Akshay-kumar Datta also wrote in the same strain. He believed that a proper system of education alone could remove all the social, political and economic evils from which Bengal was suffering. As early as 1855 he advocated free and compulsory education for all children up to the age of fifteen, the funds to be provided by curtailing military expenditure. He prepared a detailed scheme for different stages of education, in which provision was made for teaching sciences and humanities as well as technical and vocational education, including agriculture, engineering, ship-building, etc. He also suggested that vernacular should be the medium of the higher, secondary and primary education.[28] Akshay-kumar stressed the need of representative character of the government and elaborated the well-known principle that the right to impose taxes involved the duty of improving the conditions of the people.

Amelioration of the condition of the ryots was another insistent demand. Rasik-krishna Mallik and Akshay-kumar Datta vigorously championed their cause and blamed the Government for their miserable lot. Though Dwaraka-nath Tagore, Prasanna-kumar Tagore and others were champions of the rights of the Zamindars, they also supported the cause of the ryots.

Indianisation of Services was an insistent demand from all quarters. On April 18, 1843, the Hindu College students held a public meeting in the Town Hall to send a memorial to the Court of Proprietors 'praying for the bestowal of more offices on Indians'. Tarachand Chakravarty, who moved the resolution, vigorously attacked the maintenance of the Civil Service as a monopoly of Englishmen. He argued that it "represses the expansion of talent and genius among the Indians" and "promotes a sort of clanship which usually blinds the sense of justice to members of its own fraternity and thus thwarts the efforts of natives to seek redress from the grievances to which they may contribute". So he pleaded for opening it to public competition.[29] In another public meeting held in 1853, Ram-gopal Ghosh urged the necessity of throwing open the Civil Service, without any reservation, to the Indians.[30]

While there was a general desire that the Indians should be vested with more powers in regard to legislation, opinions differed widely regarding the concrete measures to be adopted to give effect to it. Raja Rammohan Roy demanded that the laws for India should be made by the King-in-Parliament and not by the Indian Government.[31] The other view was that there should be a Legislative Council for India. The Raja was opposed to it on the ground "that if any legislative council were established in India, the executive and the judicial officers would have the preponderant voice in it, and the inclusion of one or two Indian nominated members would not obviate the danger of uniting the executive, judicial, and legislative power in one body." He, therefore, suggested that the legislative measures should be initiated by the Government of India, then subjected to the criticism of leading citizens of India, and finally passed by the Parliament.[32]

As a corollary to the above, it was suggested that some representatives of Indians should be included in the British Parliament. Though the Raja himself did not make this demand, Dwaraka-ṇath Tagore suggested that each Presidency should be allowed to send two representatives to Parliament.[33] This was, however, opposed by a section of younger politicians. They held that in view of the long distance and difficulty of communication, it would be difficult to find proper Indian representatives who would be willing to stay in England, and the Indian public would have no control over them.[34]

The agitation for political reform on these lines was chiefly carried on by the friends and associates of Raja Rammohan Roy. One of them, Prasanna-kumar Tagore, started a paper called the *Reformer*. It was the first English newspaper conducted by an Indian and discussed all questions connected with local politics, political economy, literature, religion, metaphysics, jurisprudence, etc. Dr. Duff remarked about this paper that "it represented the sentiments of a party not large in number but potent in rank and wealth, the party of the celebrated Raja Rammohun Roy". In 1833 the paper had a circulation of 400 copies, which was more than that of any other paper of those days with the exception of *Bengal Hurkaru* which had a circulation of 934 copies.[35]

Dwaraka-nath Tagore, another associate of Raja Rammohan, followed a different policy in this respect. Instead of starting independent newspapers of his own he purchased large shares of the influential Anglo-Indian papers. He purchased the *India Gazette* and amalgamated it, first with the *Bengal Chronicle*, and then with *Bengal Hurkaru*. As noted above, the last-named paper had large circulation and Dwaraka-nath purchased considerable share of it, in order, we are told, to counteract the savage and unscrupulous attacks of the *John Bull* upon the natives.[36]

Among other periodicals, dealing with political topics, during this period may be mentioned the *Parthenon* (1830), the *Gyananneshun* (1831), the *Bengal Spectator* (1842), and the *Hindu Pioneer,* all started by the students of the Hindu College. As a specimen of the political views preached through these papers, the following passage may be quoted from an article entitled "India under Foreigners" published in the *Hindu Pioneer:*

"The Government of India (under the English) is purely aristocratical; the people have no voice in the council of legislature; they have no hand in framing the laws which regulate their civil conduct. We need not expatiate on the monopoly of the State Service, the law's delay, the insolence of office, the heavy expenses of Government, the retirement from India of all those who acquire wealth, and the enormous taxation to which the country is subjected —evils too well known in India. The Muhammedans patronised merit wherever it was to be found; the English, like the primitive Hindus, have one caste of men to govern the general body. The violent means by which foreign supremacy has been established, and the entire alienation of the people of the soil from any share in the Government, nay, even from all offices of trust and power, are circumstances which no commercial, no political benefits can authorise or justify."[37]

But the political leaders of Bengal did not rely on the press and platform alone for carrying on agitation for political reforms. They also realized the necessity of organizing political associations. The first to be established in Bengal was an association called "Baṅgabhāshā-Prakāśikā Sabhā", founded in 1836. As the name and activities of this association are now little known, we give a somewhat detailed account of it on the basis of reports and correspondence published in contemporary periodicals.[38] The first reference to it occurs in an anonymous letter published in the *Gyananneshun* on December 17, 1836. We learn from it that the association held a weekly meeting on Thursday evenings. The writer says that in the meeting on the previous Thursday, which he attended, the people assembled were ten times the usual number. The Chairman announced that the subject for discussion fixed in the last weekly meeting was 'whether pleasure proceeds from sorrow or arises from pleasure'. Thereupon it was pointed out by Ram-lochan Ghosh that debates on such a subject would inevitably involve religious discussion which is strictly forbidden by the tenth rule of the Association. So he proposed that the meeting should rather serve the interest of the country by discussing such topics connected with the policy and administration of the Government which concerned the welfare of the people. This being accepted with acclamation it was proposed and resolved that the meeting would formulate, after discussion, the principal abuses in the system of administration which adversely affected the interest of the people, and then try to remove them by sending petition to the Government or by other means.

Ram-lochan Ghosh then pointed out that the Englishmen, assembled in a meeting, sat on chairs with a table in the centre, and each member rose from his seat when addressing the meeting. He proposed, and the meeting agreed, that the same procedure should be followed in future.

The Chairman then pointed out that the Association had just been started and had no funds of its own. The members were also mostly poor. How would they meet the expenses for their political activities? After some discussion it was settled that the rich members would bear the expenses of costly undertakings.

It was then resolved that the next meeting would discuss the recent measure of the Government by which rent was imposed upon lands which were hitherto rent-free. Four persons were selected for drafting a memorandum upon the subject.

Ram-lochan Ghosh wrote a long letter to the Secretary, supporting the measure of the Government on several grounds. The letter was published in the Bengali periodical *Prabhākar* (December 31, 1836) with a detailed criticism by the editor, who held that as Ram-lochan was a Government Official, he had shown a partisan spirit in supporting the measure. The editor, however, added that he did not blame Shri Ghosh, for, being maintained by the Government, he might have incurred sin by writing anything against it.

The arguments and counter-arguments throw interesting light on the political thoughts of the day. Ghosh supported the resumption of rent-free lands on the ground that, as the Government had abolished the duties, there was no other means to pay off the debts of the country as the Company had already spent a lot of money out of its own funds for defending it. In reply it was pointed out that the Government was spending on Christian missions in this country about ten to twelve *lakhs* of Rupees per annum and this sum could be utilised for paying off the debt.

The huge cost of administration on account of the high salary paid to English officials was put forward against the Government. To this Ghosh replied by saying that if the people of the country were fit for high administrative duties there would have been no necessity of employing English officials at a high cost. Two of the arguments of Ghosh are very interesting. He maintained that all people had equal rights in the land and the king had no power to grant rent-free lands to a person except on the ground that he had spent his fortune for public good or fought for the country. He further held that as the Muslim kings were no better than robbers, grants of lands made by them could not be regarded as valid. As to the stipulations made in the Diwani Grant to respect such grants, Ghosh argued that the Emperor of Delhi, who gave it, was an exile, and though the English, for the sake of expediency, agreed to receive the Diwani from him, in reality they became masters of the country by their own skill and efforts.

The special pleadings of Ram-lochan Ghosh evidently represent the official views on the subject. But the "Baṅgabhāshā Prakāśikā Sabhā" regarded the Government measure as highly injurious to the country and decided to summon a public meeting to discuss the proposal of sending a petition to the Government signed by five thousand persons. A circular was accordingly widely distributed among the people in Calcutta and its immediate neighbourhood.[39]

The above news was published on January 7, 1837. We next find a news item, dated October 14, 1837, that Ram-kamal Sen has decided to start a new association with a view to sending a petition to England on behalf of the owners of rent-free lands and with a prayer to introduce Bengali as the court language.[40]

On November 12, 1837, the landholders of Calcutta and its neighbourhood met at the Hindu College to establish an association in order to safeguard their interests as the Chamber of Commerce did in regard to traders.[41] It was inaugurated in July 1838, and called "Zamindary Association", but the name was soon changed to "Landholders' Society". It was open to all persons having any stake in the land, irrespective of caste, creed, or country, and its activities would not be confined to Calcutta, as it would keep in touch with all the districts. Referring to the genesis of the Society, Rama-nath Tagore said in 1870: "Dwarakanath Tagore was one of the first native gentlemen who understood and appreciated constitutional agitation. Estimating rightly the influence of the landed aristocracy..., he established in July, 1838, the *Landholders' Society* (which took up) several questions of vital importance to the Zamindars....At the instance of the *Landholders' Society* a monstrous meeting was convened at the Town Hall for memorialising the Government against resumption measure....Babu Dwarakanath Tagore said (on the occasion) that the time would soon come when his young friends, the Hindu Collegians, would organise themselves into a compact band of patriots for the assertion or preservation of their political rights and the redress of their grievances."[42] Although the object and achievements of this political association were very limited in character, it deserves notice for three reasons. In the first place, it set the example of an organized constitutional agitation for redress of grievances by a public body. Secondly, it was the avowed object of the organizers to establish "branch societies in every district of the British Indian empire with the view of establishing regular communications on all subjects connected with the object of the society." Thirdly, it enlisted the co-operation of Englishmen who sympathised with the political aspirations of the people. This, as well as the political character of the society, will be evident from Mr. Turton's speech in a meeting of the Society on November 30, 1839, as reported in the *Bengal Hurkaru* of December 14, and 16, 1839: "It was not as a conquered nation that he desired to retain the inhabitants of India as British subjects, but as brethren in every respect; as constituting a part of the Kingdom of Britain, as fellow subjects—with the same feelings, the same interests and objects, and the same rights as the British-born inhabitants of England. He admired the principle adopted of old by the Romans, of incorporating their conquests with Rome, and granting to the conquered the privileges of Roman citizens."[43] If we remember that this speech was delivered before the publication of Durham's Report containing the idea of the Dominion Status, it must be regarded as a remarkable example of political insight.

While the Indian associates of Raja Rammohan were carrying on his work in India, his friend, William Adam, was continuing the political agitation in England on behalf of India which the Raja had initiated. In order to rouse the interests of the English public in Indian affairs, Mr. Adam established the "British India Society" in England in July 1839, and was the editor of a journal called the *British India Advocate*, published by the Society early in 1841. The "Landholders' Society" of Calcutta decided to co-operate with the "British India Society" in London, and appointed a Committee to supply regular information to the latter about the Indians' grievances and demands.

The Landholders' Society was not content with this. Fully cognisant of the beneficent effects of political agitation in England, such as was carried on by Rammohan, and after him by Adam, it decided, at the instance of Dwaraka-nath Tagore, to appoint paid agents in England for the same purpose. This novel procedure continued for some time, and had important consequences for the future.

In a meeting of the Landholders' Society held on July 17, 1843, Thompson[43a] was appointed such an agent. He was a well-known public man in England and had accompanied Dwaraka-nath Tagore when he returned from London in January, 1843. He aroused unparalleled enthusiasm among the young Bengalis by a series of lectures and was mainly instrumental in founding the 'Bengal British India Society' on April 20, 1843. Five resolutions were passed in the inaugural meeting explaining the scope and object of the Society. The third, moved by Tara-chand Chakravarty, defined the object of the Society to be "the collection and dissemination of information relating to the actual condition of the people of British India...and to employ such other means of a peaceable and lawful character, as may appear calculated to secure the welfare, extend the just rights, and advance the interests of all classes of our fellow-subjects".[44]

There were thus, since 1843, two political associations in Bengal, *viz.*, the 'Landholders' Society' and the 'Bengal British India Society.' As a contemporary remarked, the first represented aristocracy of wealth, and the other, aristocracy of intelligence. None of these can be said to have achieved great popularity, but there can be hardly any doubt that they served to rouse the political consciousness of the people.[45] This became evident in 1849 when four Bills were drafted by Bethune, the Law Member of the Government, with a view, among others, to extend the jurisdiction of the East India Company's Criminal Courts over the British-born subjects. Hitherto, these were subject only to the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court in Calcutta, with the result that the people in mofussil had practically no judicial remedy against their oppression by the British, as it was hardly possible for them to carry on litigation in the Supreme Court in Calcutta.[46] But though the Bills were eminently just, and the Indians strongly supported them, the European community in Bengal characterized them as "Black Acts" and carried on such a violent agitation that the Government was forced to withdraw them in spite of strong protests of the Bengali leaders. The educated community of Bengal was profoundly shocked, and felt the need of a strong political association, not only to safeguard Indian interests against the organized attacks of the European community, but also to represent Indian views to the Parliament on the eve of the renewal of the Charter Act. The result was that the two existing political associations in Bengal silently merged themselves into a new one named the "British Indian Association".[47]

The British Indian Association was founded on October 29, 1851.[47a] From the very beginning it had an all-India outlook. We learn from its first Annual Report that the Committee of the Association carried on correspondence with leading political figures of other Provinces. It also notes with satisfaction the establishment of associations of a similar character at Poona, Madras and Bombay. According to the second Annual Report, the Committee of the British Indian Association kept up a friendly correspondence with the associations of the sister Presidencies.

The political association started at Madras was originally a branch of the British Indian Association of Calcutta. A petition[48] submitted by the Madras Association to the British Parliament supplies very interesting information on the method of work and general political outlook of the British Indian Association. As the facts and views stated in this petition are not generally known it may be quoted in extenso.

"1. That your petitioners, being desirous to avail themselves of the opportunity afforded by the approaching expiration of the Charter granted to the Honourable East India Company for going before Parliament with an exposition of various circumstances connected with Government of this country, which, as acknowledged subjects of Her Majesty, they feel to be serious grievances urgently demanding redress, formed an association at Madras, on the 26th of February, 1852, for the purpose of co-operating in this great object with a similar association established at Calcutta, under the name of the British Indian Association, with whom they immediately entered into correspondence, intending, *as a branch society*, to place themselves under the guidance of that body, to whose superintendence the work of petitioning the Imperial Parliament, on points involving the joint interests of both Presidencies, should be committed. That for this purpose they had previously been collecting the requisite information from various quarters, collecting a large amount of manuscript statements, together with printed documents, in order to ensure the utmost correctness regarding the subjects to be laid before your Right Honourable House.

"2. That in the course of the above-mentioned correspondence, the Calcutta Association transmitted to your Petitioners the sketch of a petition, to which the consent of your Petitioners, with such suggestions thereon as they might deem requisite, was requested: but that the said sketch related almost wholly to plans and recommendations of change in the Government of this country for the exaltation of the highest classes of the Hindus, while it left almost untouched the pitiable condition of the middling and lower classes. and was in various respects unsuitable to the circumstances of the inhabitants of this Presidency; your Petitioners, thence perceiving that there were many important points in which a joint interest could not be taken, and others in which there could not be joint concurrence, deemed it expedient to *withdraw from their connection as a branch association,* subordinate to that of the metropolis, and to constitute from among themselves an independent society, under the denomination of the Madras Native Association, with the view of bringing before Parliament the immediate grievances of their own Presidency." These grievances have been noted above.[49]

The British Indian Association had great faith in the British goodwill and sense of justice, and its Secretary, Devendra-nath Tagore wrote in his report that "there can be no doubt that when the real state of things is understood, the British Parliament will not long delay justice to India." Accordingly, as mentioned above, in 1852, when the new Charter Act was under consideration, a petition was sent to the Parliament, in the name of the British Indian Association and other native inhabitants of the Bengal Presidency, complaining against grievances and praying for relief. It dwelt at great length upon the evils of the union of political or executive power with the legislative, and prayed for the establishment of a separate Legislature, possessing a popular character. Among other prayers in the petition may be mentioned the reduction of the salaries of the higher officers, separation of the functions of magistrates and judges, abolition of salt duty, abkari duty, and the stamp duties; and discontinuance of the payment for ecclesiastical establishment.[50]

That the Association, and the Indian political leaders in general, laid great stress on the inclusion of Indians in the Legislative Council, would appear from the pamphlet written by Peary-chand Mitra on behalf of the British Indian Association about the same time as the above petition was sent. In this pamphlet, entitled *Notes on the evidence on Indian Affairs,* he urged for the inclusion of Indians in the Legislative Council and discussed the evidence given by many Englishmen, including high officials, on the subject before the Committee of the two Houses in 1852.[51] In this connection, we meet for the first time with the idea of communal representation which played such an important role in the evolution of Indian Constitution in the twentieth century. F. G. Halliday observed, in course of his evidence, that as the Hindus and the Musalmans were divided, the representation of Indians would be difficult. Lord Ellenborough, in his evidence, even suggested the creation of two Chambers of Legislature in India—one for the Hindus and another for the Muhammadans. It may be noted in passing that Ellenborough was not actuated by any love for Muslims in making this proposal. As Governor-General he wrote in 1843: "I cannot close my eyes to the belief that that race (Muhammadans) is fundamentally hostile to us and our true policy is to reconciliate the Hindus". This is one of the earliest pronouncements of the *Divide and Rule* policy adopted by the British Government, as mentioned above.[52] Against Halliday's remark Pearychand Mitra wrote as follows:

> "This remark (of Halliday) as to divisions applies to the social and religious state of the country, and the matters on which differences exist have little connection with legislation, and do not require separate representation. That body wants generally information on subjects connected with the internal administration of the country, on which the people think and feel substantially in the same manner; and even supposing that the community is divided in opinion, on subjects coming within the cognizance of legislature, who but a native can be competent to report the sentiments of the people at large?"[53]

The Association noted with satisfaction that the Charter Act of 1853 gave effect to some of their demands. But though the Association's prayer for the separation of the Legislature from the Executive was partially granted by the addition of six members to the Governor-General's Council for legislative purposes, its demand for the inclusion of some Indians in the Legislature was not conceded. The additional members were all Europeans, and the Association pointed out that it was utterly vain to expect that "the Europeans who do not mix with the people and cannot therefore know their sentiments and feelings on the different questions connected with the framework of native society and the internal administration of the country, should rightly represent them". The Association therefore continued the agitation for the inclusion of Indians in the Legislative Council, and demanded the recognition of the principle of equality of all classes of citizens in the eye of the law. It also prayed for increasing the Government grant for education and the holding of the Civil Service examination in India. Two petitions were sent to Parliament in 1856 and 1860 incorporating these demands.

The Association brought to the notice of the Local Government the manifold grievances of the people, and suggested various measures of reform. It established local branches and tried to rouse the interest of the masses in political questions. For this purpose it translated various Bills into Bengali and circulated them extensively all over the Province for eliciting public opinion. It also framed questionnaire on important current topics like indigo-planting and similarly circulated them.

Advanced political ideas such as those advocated by the British Indian Association were also preached by distinguished Bengalis.

Anyone who goes through the political literature of the period is sure to be struck by the fact that many of the thoughts and ideas expressed by them formed the basis of live political issues even in the first quarter of the twentieth century. A few may be noted as specimens. Both Peary-chand Mitra and Ram-gopal Ghosh urged the necessity of throwing open all offices, including the Civil Service, without any reservation, to Indians on the grounds of equity, economy and the good of India.[54] Dwaraka-nath Tagore advocated the introduction of trial by jury both in the Supreme Court and mofussil Courts.[55] Prasanna-kumar Tagore showed from the *Mitāksharā* that the jury system was not unknown in India and regarded it as the best guarantee for fair and impartial justice.[56] Kishori-chand Mitra strongly condemned the exemption of British-born subjects from the jurisdiction of the ordinary courts in the mofussil, and regarded it as unconstitutional and unjust in principle and often oppressive in practice.[57] Govinda-chandra Dutt, who was the first to denounce such inequality in the eye of the law, as early as 1846, also strongly advocated the separation of executive and judicial powers and raised his voice of protest against imprisonment, even of bad characters, on mere suspicion without adequate proof. In this connection he referred to the laws and practice prevailing in France and England.[58] Dakshina-ranjan Mukhopadhyay proposed that each Province should have a council consisting of Government nominees and representatives of the people in equal number, the latter being elected by people of each district possessing a reasonable property qualification. There should also be a Supreme Council, half of whose members would be nominated by Government and the other half by the Provincial Councils.[59]

The British Indian Association was somewhat aristocratic in its composition, and in the light of later political evolution in this country, undoubtedly appears as conservative in character; yet considering the political consciousness of the Indians at that period it is only fair to admit that it played a very important role in the political evolution of India. This is all the more necessary as even eminent Indian politicians have done scant justice to this body. Bipin-chandra Pal, for example, has stated that neither the British Indian Association, nor any political association in any other province started before the Indian Association of Calcutta, had an all-India outlook.[60] This is certainly an unmerited and unfair comment, so far at least as the British Indian Association is concerned. It is apparent from the petition of the Madras Native Association, quoted above, that the British Indian Association had a close and intimate touch with other parts of India and that it circulated the draft memorial to Parliament in 1852 to the political associations of other Provinces inviting their suggestions upon it. If we remember the state of communication between different parts of India about this time, we must give credit to the British Indian Association for an all-India outlook, but for which they would not have taken troubles to keep in touch with such remote parts of India as Madras, Bombay and Poona.

Similarly, there has been a change of opinion regarding the nature and activities of the British Indian Association. A young writer, who has recently made a study of the old proceedings of the Association, sums up her views in the following lines:

"Many, indeed, would be surprised to know that the British Indian Association was founded not as a Zemindars' Association but as a national political organisation, with the object of urging constitutional and administrative reforms and representing the views of the enlightened Indian community on these matters to the authorities in India and England. Its rules and its actual deliberations were those of a national political organisation and not of a close corporation of landlords".[61] The object of the Association was defined to be to "promote the improvement and efficiency of the British Indian Government by every legitimate means in its power and thereby to advance the common interests of Great Britain and India and to ameliorate the condition of the native inhabitants of the subject territory".[62]

Though the "original members were drawn almost wholly from one particular class, representing landed interests (not at all surprising in the context of the social and political conditions of the time), it was never intended to keep the Association a close corporation of landlords. Within a few years men belonging to other classes were admitted as members, and particularly from the 'seventies there was an increasing number of merchants, industrialists, lawyers, doctors and journalists in the membership of the Association. Thus, within two decades the body became fairly broad-based, and it represented the upper layer of society no more than the Indian Association or the Indian National Congress at the time".[63]

This view is supported by copious references to the activities of the Association. The following extract would prove interesting in the light of later events:

"In 1869 Surendranath Banerjee, disqualified for the Indian Civil Service, sought the intervention of the British Indian Association, and in 1895 M. K. Gandhi, described at the time as the agent of the Indian community in South Africa, sought the assistance of the British Indian Association to urge upon the Government of India the necessity of taking measures for the amelioration of the lot of the Indians in South Africa. The position of the British Indian Association as the most influential public body in India was so well-recognised that whether it was a Zemindar insulted and wrongly arrested by the District Magistrate, or a dismissed Police Clerk, or Hindu pilgrims ill-treated at a religious fair at Hardwar or a descendant of the Nawab of the Carnatic claiming back his patrimony, everyone turned to the British Indian Association for a redress of grievances. Similarly the authorities also sought the views of the British Indian Association, as representing Indian public opinion and not merely that of the Zemindar class, on every possible issue,—a draft Bill or postal re-organization, Famine policy or Judicial reforms, construction of Railways or building a second port near Calcutta, Hooghly Bridge or Municipal administration, Finance or Epidemic, private latrines or burning ghats, education or public works, Suttee or Charak Puja".[64]

It is interesting to note, however, that the British Indian Association failed to satisfy the advanced democratic views of the country. As noted above, the Madras Branch seceded from it on the ground that it looked to the interests only of the upper classes and not of 'middling and lower classes'. The same idea was prevalent even among a section of the Bengalis.

A somewhat humorous review of a political association, named 'The National Association', was published in the *Samāchāra-darpaṇa* in its issue of December 13, 1851. While commending the good intentions of the Association it remarks that this body only looks to the interests of the Zamindars (landholders), and concludes as follows: "No cultivator attends the meeting of the association nor is likely to do so. If the peasant Gopal expresses his own view in its meeting he is sure to be put to ridicule."[65] The National Association was founded on September 14, 1851, at the house of Paikpara Raj, but was superseded by the British Indian Association established a month and a half later.[65a] The remarks are therefore fully applicable to it and prove that political views in the country were moving far in advance of the political organisations. But it must be noted that all these criticisms were levelled at the early stages, and, as shown above, the British Indian Association outlived its unpopularity.

Other indications were not wanting to prove the increasing interest taken by the people in political questions. Dwaraka-nath Tagore lamented in the forties that public meetings did not attract large audience, and prophesied that things would change with the spread of English education. His prophecy was fulfilled. We have the record of a public meeting in connection with the renewal of the East India Company's Charter in 1853. On 3 June, 1853, Wood introduced in the British House of Commons the new scheme for the Government of India. On 29 July, Ram-gopal Ghosh addressed a public meeting in the Town Hall, Calcutta. The number of people present in the Hall and its immediate neighbourhood was variously estimated between three to ten thousand, and hundreds had to return for want of space. Almost every native gentleman of distinction, resident in or near Calcutta, attended the meeting. The exclusion of Indians from the higher services and other grievances formed the theme of the speech delivered by Ram-gopal Ghosh. It was eulogized by the London *Times* as a masterpiece of oratory.[66]

The British Indian Association continued the policy initiated by Dwaraka-nath Tagore of appointing paid agents from amongst the public men of England to carry on agitation for Indian reform in that country. During the first three years of its existence it spent not less than Rs. 20,000 for this purpose.

The petition sent by the political associations of India to the Parliament in 1852 created a stir in England. Several friends of India, including John Bright and Joseph Hume, raised their powerful voice in favour of the petitioners. Cobden even went so far as to suggest that India should be ruled by the Indians themselves. On March 13, 1853, there was a meeting of 'The friends of India' and it constituted itself an "India Reform Society". This was highly appreciated by Indian leaders. The Charter of the East India Company was to expire soon, and the main object of the Society was to ensure that the customary Parliamentary inquiry before the renewal of the Charter should be full and impartial. The facts collected by the Society were supplied by John Dickinson to Bright who made several impassioned speeches on India in the House of Commons. How far these influenced that august body at the time is difficult to determine. It is, however, claimed by some that Bright's speeches on India "led to the issue of Queen Victoria's memorable Proclamation of 1858 and did much to determine the wise and humane policy under Lord Canning, which followed the Indian Mutiny." Bright worked consistently to advance the political interests of India during his whole political career from 1847 to 1880.

Reference may be made in this connection to Karl Marx who made England his home. On the eve of the renewal of the Company's Charter in 1853 he wrote a series of letters to the *New York Daily Tribune* explaining the conditions of the Indian masses and the ruthless spoliation of India by the British.

III. POLITICAL IDEAS AND ASSOCIATIONS OUTSIDE BENGAL.

A. Bombay

Next to Bengal, we may trace the growth of political consciousness more clearly in Bombay than in any other part of India. In certain respects the people of Maharashtra were more national-minded than the political thinkers of Bengal referred to above. This was due to the historical background of Maharashtra as distinguished from that of Bengal. The Bengali Hindus felt the establishment of the British rule as a providential dispensation to make them free from the tyrannical rule of the Muslims. This was not the feeling of the Maharashtra people, because they had freed themselves from the Muslim rule long ago, and looked upon the Britishers as foreign enemies who defeated them and baulked them of their ambition to establish their own supremacy in India. This difference in the historical background of the two provinces explains the difference in the attitudes of the liberal political thinkers in Bengal and Maharashtra.

This difference is most prominently brought out by the writings of Shri Bhaskar Pandurang Tarkhadkar in the *Bombay Gazette*. He regularly contributed to this paper for about six years, and a fair idea of the extreme views, bordering on hatred against the British rule, preached by him as early as 1841, may be formed from the following extracts:

"If I were to give you credit for your having saved us from the Pindaris and Ramosis, your trading system stands in the way which has indeed more effectually emptied our purses in a few years than the predatory excursions of these tribes could do in some five or six hundred years. In short it must be acknowledged that your progress in cunning and craftiness has kept pace with your advancement in knowledge and wisdom."

* * *

"To say that the country taken possession of by a horde of foreign usurpers, whose sole aim is to enrich themselves at the expense of its real masters, is prospering under them, is as absurd as to conclude that a town left at the tender mercies of a gang of robbers is enjoying all the advantages of peace and security in spite of their depredations and oppressions."

* * *

"I shall now just ask you what could have induced your Government to harbour so much jealousy and hatred of so wise and eminent a Prince as Purtab Singh, as to sacrifice your good name and every consideration of national honour and good faith only to depose him....A weak and imbecile ruler better suits your purpose, you could exercise your control upon the latter in the same degree as a landlord in England does over his vassals, and hem him in on all sides so as to make him a mere pageant in your hands while your political ingenuity cannot meet with equal success with the former. Among all the Native Princes in India the Ex-Raja of Sattara was the only one that could be said to have some knowledge of politics and a better known Indian Prince we have never heard of; but the same thing which would have recommended him to the esteem of good people, has been the cause of his downfall."

* * *

"We cannot look upon your Government in any other light than that of the most bitter curse India has ever been visited with. The whole wealth of India has now been transported to Great Britain and we have no employment left to us."

* * *

"Oh unhappy fate! India has been got hold of by a race of demons who would never be satisfied until they have despoiled her of all her precious things and reduced her sons and daughters to total beggary. I have heard the most pious of you say that a bare clothing and coarse fare is all that we require for our maintenance in the world. If such be your notions of our wants, excuse Mr. Editor, if my modesty gives way to resentment, could I not say with an equal degree of truth and sincerity that a piece of leather upon your shoulders and a carcass of hog or bullock for your food would be quite sufficient to answer all your necessary calls."

* * *

"You not only withhold from us high appointments, but you would not permit us to have a voice in your administration of our country,—which latter circumstance weighs heavily upon us. Your Law Commission, composed of a few individuals who know little or nothing of India, have absolute power to construct regulations and laws for our Government! Is it in union with the dictates of sound principle and common humanity that we, the proper persons who should be consulted on such occasions, we, who know a thousand times much better how to promote our own interests than others, should be excluded from concerting measures for our own good, while a body of foreigners who care for the welfare of the Natives no more than they do for a broken reed, much less than having any regard for our comfort and happiness, be invested with full authority to rule the destinies of a population so vast and extensive as that of India?"

Similar views about Indian rights and British usurpations have been expressed by Gopal Hari Deshmukh, better known as

Lokahitawadi, a Government employee in the Judicial Service. During 1848-9 he wrote a series of letters to the weekly Marathi paper, the *Prabhākar* of Bombay, in which he not only spoke very frankly about the faults of the British régime but even issued a solemn warning to the British administrators in the following words: "If you try to impose any legislation on us, against our wish, we will unite and ask you to quit. Please therefore be careful and administer the law considerately." Such was the burthen of his writings. He also pleaded for *swadeshi* or the use of indigenous goods in preference to articles of foreign manufacture, and suggested that a regular movement should be started with this object in order to help the Indian industries and to counteract the spread of poverty and unemployment in the country. He also suggested that Parliamentary institutions should be established in India and that the Indians should have a right to sit in the British Parliament. In his Marathi publication, entitled *History of Gujarāt*, he appended a comparative statement of the benefits and evils of the British rule and of the old Peshwa régime. Even as early as 1848, he visualised the distant prospect of India becoming completely independent like the United States of America after having learnt the lesson of parliamentary government under the guidance of the British people.[67]

Reference may be made in this connection to Vishnubuwa Brahmachari, a pioneer of the revivalist attitude of mind towards the social and religious movement. He had full faith in the superiority of the Indian culture over the Western civilization and he preached that Indians should look back to the Vedic times when, according to him, Indian culture had attained perfection. His mind was very original, and it is curious to find that he preached certain ideas in the economic field which are similar to those of modern socialism. He advocated collective ownership of land, socialisation of factories, and equal distribution of their produce among the masses. His social ideal was that of human brotherhood and a welfare state. He may well be described as a utopian socialist who based his social ideals on Vedic religion, and may be compared to the Christian socialists of Europe.

Vishnubuwa's solicitude for the masses led him to create a political party to represent the interests and ideas of the village folk in Maharashtra. But his defiant challenge to Brahmin leadership of his time created an undesirable split between the upper classes and the masses which ultimately led to some unfortunate developments in the public life of the province.

The next stage in the development of political ideas and political associations in Bombay is closely bound up with the name of Dadabhai Naoroji. Shortly after graduating from the Elphinstone College, Bombay, he devoted himself to social reform, particularly education of women. In a meeting held under his Presidency was founded the "Students' Literary and Scientific Society", which undertook the cause of national regeneration. He was the heart and soul of all the political organizations in Bombay, and when his professional career required his residence in London, he organized several associations there to work for the cause of India. It was due in no small measure to his unwearied efforts that the Indian cause got such a good hearing in England.

Soon after the British Indian Association was founded in Calcutta, Bombay followed suit. On August 26, 1852, a public meeting of the Indian citizens of Bombay was held in the rooms of the Elphinstone Institute, and it inaugurated the first political association in the Bombay Presidency, named 'The Bombay Association.'[68] The meeting was presided over by Shri Jagannath Shankershet and the object of the Association was defined in the first resolution to be 'to ascertain the wants of the natives of India in the Bombay Presidency and to represent to the authorities from time to time the measures calculated to advance the welfare and improvement of the country'. This was further elaborated in the fourth resolution which ran as follows:

"That this Association shall from time to time, on occasions arising, memorialize the Government authorities in India, or in England, for the removal of existing evils, and for the prevention of proposed measures which may be deemed injurious, or for the introduction of enactments which may tend to promote the general interests of all connected with this country." Save that the sphere of its activity was strictly limited to the Presidency of Bombay, the Association followed the British Indian Association of Calcutta, and they set the general pattern of constitutional agitation which was to dominate Indian politics for the rest of the nineteenth century.

The third resolution directed the Association to take advantage of the discussion, then going on in Britain for the renewal of the Charter of the East India Company, "to represent to the Imperial Parliament of Great Britain such reforms and improvements in the existing system of government as are calculated to procure the most efficient administration of public affairs, and secure the general welfare and interests of the people of India." With this object in view the Association was directed "to open communication with, and seek the co-operation of, the Societies formed for the same purposes at Calcutta and Madras." It is thus quite clear that the political consciousness, so far at least as Madras and Bombay were concerned, was galvanized into activities, for the first time, by the prospect of improving the administration of India through the renewal of the Charter of the Company, and they followed the lead given by Bengal.

Like the two Associations of Calcutta and Madras, the Bombay Association also sent a petition to the British Parliament in 1853, criticizing the system of administration and suggesting remedial measures[69] more or less on the same line. Some of its observations are, however, worth quoting. The Government, both of Bombay and other Presidencies, it is said, "is quite unequal to the efficient discharge of its duties and that nothing but the impenetrable veil of secrecy with which even its most trivial acts are covered protects it from universal condemnation." The members of the Council, selected by patronage rather than on grounds of merit, " have no specific duties to discharge and little or no responsibility as things may always be outvoted by the Governor." "The practical effect of a Government so constituted is that for the most part each Secretary in his own Department is the Governor in Council." The system of secrecy which shuts out all healthy public scrutiny and public criticism bearing on the administration is "the ruling principle or vice in Indian administration." "Its obvious tendency is to engender and perpetuate amongst the young servants of Government an illiberal and despotic tone, to give full scope to the prejudices, the ignorance and the self-sufficiency of all; to discourage progress; to discountenance all schemes of improvement emanating from independent and disinterested sources, and not within the view of the officer to whose department they are referred." The Association therefore recommended the abolition of the existing Councils and creation of new ones "of which the judges of the Supreme Court in legislative matters and some of the European and native citizens should form a part"—such councils having the power to call for the proceedings of Government and its local officers. As regards the Executive Government the Association observed that "it would be highly desirable that there should always be among the more prominent members some persons trained and experienced in the public offices of England, who can bring to the consideration of public affairs a more extended knowledge and wider views than are to be expected from these European gentlemen who have passed all their days from boyhood in the bad system of the country and know no other by which to compare and improve them." The Association strongly condemned the recruitment through the Haileybury College and the exclusion of Indians from all higher services. The Association also protested against the 'exorbitant salaries of many highly paid officers whose duties are so trifling or involve, comparatively, so little labour or responsibility that they might with advantage be amalgamated with other offices or remunerated in a manner commensurate with the nature of the duties to be performed.' Finally, the Association prayed for the separation of the Executive and Judicial branches and the establishment of University or College as proposed by Mr. Cameron for the purpose of qualifying the Natives for Government employ.

The petition as well as the speeches made at the inaugural meeting clearly express the buoyant faith of the leaders in the British Government. The President of the meeting assured his audience "that efforts on the part of natives to improve their own condition cannot but be looked on with pleasure by the paternal and enlightened Government that rules over this country, and meet with encouragement in proportion to their reasonableness and justice." Naoroji Furdunji observed: "The British Government, which is an enlightened and liberal Government, and professes to govern India for its own sake, will, I feel confident, be always ready and willing to hear the respectful appeals, the reasonable remonstrances, and the earnest representations which the native subjects may consider it proper to make for the amelioration of the conditions of this country and the welfare of its people." Although Dadabhai Naoroji was a Government servant, he addressed the meeting, and his speech contains the basic principles of his political philosophy. A deep faith in the benefits of the British rule and a wish for the permanence of that rule were the starting points. All the errors of the British Government were believed to have been due to ignorance and the remedy lay in agitation. Although efforts to obtain redress from the local authorities repeatedly received a rude rebuff, a belief grew that the liberty-loving people of England with their traditional love for justice and freedom would extend a helping hand to their Indian fellow-subjects, even though the local officials might not be sympathetic. These principles were held by Dadabhai throughout his life. He believed with his British colleagues, Hume and Wedderburn, that the interests of the Indian people and the British people were essentially the same, and the continuance of the British connection could be made to conform to the best interests of India.

Dadabhai Naoroji may be said to be the founder of the Moderate School of politicians in India whose principles he summed up as follows: "If the British people were true to themselves, true to their inbred sense and traditions of equality, justice and fair play, they would help India to obtain freedom. The Government of India may be unsympathetic or even hostile, but the real masters are the people of England." "We Indian people believe," he used to say, "that although John Bull is a little thick-headed, once we can penetrate through his head into his brain that a certain thing is right and proper to be done, you may be quite sure that it will be done."[70]

It may be noted that the Bombay Association represented the advanced section of political thinkers in Bombay. The demands made in the petition and its general tone were objected to by several Indians who seceded from the movement. The Anglo-Indian newspapers also violently attacked the Association with the exception of the *Spectator* which sought to win over the affection of the natives.[71]

B. Madras

The origin of the Madras Native Association, first as a branch of the British Indian Association, Calcutta, and then as an independent political organization, has been narrated above.[72] The Madras Native Association sent two petitions to the House of Commons in 1853, and copious extracts from these have been given above.[73] These petitions, enumerating the grievances most keenly felt by the people, throw a great deal of light on the progress of political ideas in the Madras Presidency. They are specially valuable, as we have very little information on this subject from any other source.

Unfortunately, we have no record of the later activities of the Association. A. C. Mazumdar has observed that it was "chiefly worked by some officials, possessed very little vitality, and had practically little or no hold upon the public mind in Madras."[74] We have no means to determine how far this view is correct.

---

1. Seeley, *Expansion of England,* p. 203.
2. Mill, *Representative Government.* Griffiths, 237.
3. *Works,* xix-xx.
4. Ibid, xx.
5. Ibid.
6. This categorical statement, published in the issue of the *Calcutta Gazette* of the same evening, shows that Derozio was born in 1808, and not 1809, as is generally supposed. The mention of his appointment to the Hindu College in the *Samāchāra-chandrikā* of 13 May, 1826 (Banerji, B.N., I. 32) shows that the proposed dates, 1827 and 1828 for this event are wrong. The account of Derozio and his students is based upon (1) B. Majumdar, 82-6; (2) *Bengal Renaissance,* 16-32; and (3) *Selections from Calcutta Gazette* (1824-32), pp. 420, 700. The statement on p. 38, line 33, above, should be amended accordingly.

6a. See above, pp. 39-40.
7. *Works,* p. 462.
8. See p. 232.
9. *Works,* p. xxiii.
10. Ibid. xxiv ff.
11. It may be noted here that as early as June 27, 1818, the utility and importance of trial by jury were explained in the *Samāchāra-darpaṇa.*. The same paper, in its issue of 16th June, 1827, exhorted the people to try to secure greater share in the work of administration. To the argument that this would induce corruption, the paper replied: "This fact does not prove that the natives ought for ever to be excluded from responsible situations in the land of their birth." (B. Majumdar, 158).
12. B. Majumdar, 96.
13. *Bangaśrī* (Bengali Periodical), Āshāḍh, 1340 B.S. p. 708. The *Bengal Spectator* expressed the same view (*Bengal Renaissance,* 146).
14. B. Majumdar, 71-2.
15. *Works,* 315-20; B. Majumdar, 72-4.
16. B. Majumdar, 74.
17. Ibid, 95.
18. *Works,* 439.
19. B. Majumdar, 100-1.
20. Ibid, 117.
21. Ibid, 120.
22. Ibid.
23. Ibid, 186-7.
24. Ibid, 194.
25. *Selections from the Writings,* 117.
26. Mitra, K., *Memoir,* 55.
27. B. Majumdar, 112-3.
28. Ibid, 139-46.
29. Ibid, 113-4.
30. Ibid, 207.
31. Ibid, 33.
32. Ibid, 34, 41, 44-5.
33. Ibid, 199.
34. Ibid, 104.
35. Ibid, 161.
36. Ibid, 162.
37. Ibid, 90-1.
38. The account that follows is based on B.N. Banerji, II. 289 ff., III. 313 ff.
39. Ibid, II. 290.
40. Ibid, 292.
41. Ibid, 292; B. Majumdar, 163.
42. Sujata Ghosh in the *Report of the Regional Records Survey Committee for West Bengal* (1957-8), p. 19.
43. B. Majumdar, 164.
43a. For Thompson's speeches on India, cf. Vol. IX, p. 398.
44. B. Majumdar, 170-2.
45. Referring to the Landholders' Society, Rajendra-lal Mitra said that he looked upon it as the pioneer of freedom in this country. It gave to the people the first lesson in the art of fighting constitutionally to assert their claims and give expression to their opinions. Ostensibly, it advocated the rights of the Zamindars, but as their rights were intimately bound up with those of the ryots, the one cannot be separated from the other (*Raja Rajendralal Mitra's Speeches,* edited by Rai Jogeshur Mitter, p. 25; quoted in B. Majumdar, p. 165 f.n.).
46. See Vol. IX, pp. 345-6.
47. It appears that a new political organization, known as the "National Association" was founded by the Zamindars on September 14, 1851, its chief promoters being Prasanna-kumar Tagore and Devendra-nath Tagore. As the latter was the first Secretary of both this as well as the British Indian Association, founded about a month and a half later, it may be presumed that the first was merged into the second, particularly as nothing more was heard about the "National Association". For a short account of this Association cf. J. C. Bagal, *Devendranath Tagore* (in Bengali), pp. 58-59.

47a. Sujata Ghosh, op. cit., 20. B. Majumdar (p. 177) gives the date as 31 October, but the former is the correct view as it is given in the *Citizen* of 8 November, 1851. (Bagal, J. C., *Devendranath Tagore*, p. 60).
48. There is a copy of it in the Madras Archives.
49. Vol. IX, pp. 389-93. The italics in the petition are mine. For reference, cf. ibid.
50. For details, cf. Vol. IX, pp. 393-5.
51. B. Majumdar, 211 ff.
52. See pp. 320 ff.
53. B. Majumdar, 213.
54. Ibid, 214.
55. Ibid, 195.
56. Ibid, 189.
57. Ibid, 218.
58. Ibid, 222-4.
59. Ibid, 123.
60. Ibid, 178 f.n.
61. Sujata Ghosh, op. cit., 16.
62. Ibid, 20.
63. Ibid, 21.
64. Ibid, 17.
65. *Prabāsī* (Bengali Periodical), 1347 B.S. Phalgun, p. 613.
65a. cf. f.n. 47 above.
66. *Calcutta Review,* 1867, Vol. 46, p. 517.
67. The writer is indebted to Shri S. R. Tikekar for information about Lokahitawadi.
68. Masani, *Dadabhai,* pp. 52 ff. cf. *Freedom—Bombay,* 133.
69. For the petition, cf. *Freedom—Bombay,* 139; also Griffiths, 255.
70. Masani, *Dadabhai,* p. 96.
71. Ibid, 52 ff.
72. See pp. 449-50.
73. Vol. IX, pp. 389-93.
74. *Indian National Evolution,* p. 6.

CHAPTER XIII (LI)

BIRTH OF NATIONALISM

Reference has been made in Chapter III to the impact of English education and, through it, of Western ideas, on the Indians, specially in Bengal. It produced both good and bad effects. Among the former prominence must be given to the growth of rationalism, leading to freedom of thought, and liberalism, three of the great characteristics of Modern Age, that replaced blind faith and inveterate habit of following traditional ways which marked the Medieval Age. But during the process of transformation a strong reaction set in, producing a very undesirable effect. For, as has been mentioned above, a section of the English-educated Bengali youths was carried away by a strong current of Western culture. They became very much anglicised and had inordinate fondness for everything English. They adopted Western ideas and habits, dresses and mannerisms, customs and usages, and openly indicated their repugnance to everything Indian. They spoke in English, thought in English, and, as humorously remarked by Bhudeb Mukherji, probably even dreamed in English. They had a sneering contempt for almost everything Indian. The evils grew with the spread of English education, and, in the course of time, a small group of Westernised people formed a distinct section within the Indian community.

But, fortunately, a reaction against the sweeping current of Western influence was not long in coming. It manifested itself in the growth of an intense nationalism during the third quarter of the nineteenth century. It may be truly said that if rationalism was the watchword of the first generation of English-educated Bengalis, that of the second generation was nationalism.

Among the factors contributing to it an important place must be given to the growing knowledge of the glory and greatness of the ancient Hindus. When the Indians first began to learn English, little was known of their ancient history, and even the comprehensive and standard history of India like that written by James Mill about that time unhesitatingly expressed the view that the Hindus had ever been in the same abject condition in which the Englishmen found them in the eighteenth century.[1] The very poor knowledge that the Indians themselves possessed about their own past history is shown by the history of the Hindu kings written by Mrityunjay Vidyalankar, a Pandit of the Fort William College in Calcutta, in the year 1808.[2] The works of early oriental scholars like Sir William Jones, Prinsep, Böhtlingk and other Europeans had not yet reached or impressed the general public. But the regular archaeological explorations and excavations, commencing in A.D. 1861 under the personal supervision of Alexander Cunningham, and the writings of Max Müller, Wilson, Fergusson, Rajendra Lal Mitra and others in a more popular form, brought home to the educated Indians a very vivid picture of the past glory and greatness of ancient India which placed her on the same pedestal with Greece and Rome. This inspired the Hindus with a sense of their rich heritage from the past and the leading part they once played as a great nation in the history of the world. It necessarily generated in their minds a spirit of self-confidence and held out before them a bright vision of their future destiny. The views promulgated by European scholars that the forefathers of the Hindus belonged to the same group of mankind from which were derived all the nations of Europe famous in ancient and modern times; that the Vedas, the sacred literature of the Hindus, were the oldest literary works in the world; that the Upanishads contained the most profound philosophical speculations that human mind has ever conceived;[3] that Emperor Asoka united the whole of India and Afghanistan under one rule, as testified to by his own records engraved on stone more than two thousand years ago; and that, thanks mainly to his efforts, Buddhism, originating in India, played a great role in civilising a large portion of the population of the world, so much so, that even today one-fifth of the human race still profess that faith;—all these could not fail to stir deeply the hearts of the Hindus with the result that they were imbued with a spirit of nationalism and ardent patriotism. The revelation of India's past was one of the strongest foundations on which Indian nationalism was built, and gave it that stamp of Hindu character which made its influence felt in many ways at different stages of political evolution in India.

Another factor that must have stimulated the growth of nationalism in India was the strong current of nationalist ideas which passed over the whole of Europe and South America during the nineteenth century. The momentous revolutions in U.S.A. and France during the last quarter of the eighteenth century, which the English-educated Indians read in their books, roused their patriotic feelings. But they were far more deeply stirred by the national revolts happening in their own times, reports of which were regularly received in India. It was a happy coincidence that the period during which the English education spread in India also witnessed that phase in the history of Europe and America of which the most distinctive feature was the development of the idea of nationality. About a dozen national

States sprang into existence between 1822 and 1830, mostly out of the Turkish, Spanish and Portuguese empires. All these as well as the ideas and events culminating in the struggles for freedom in different regions of Europe in 1830 and 1848, and the stories of heroic resistance and untold sufferings associated with them, made a profound impression upon the English-educated Indians. In particular, the liberation from foreign yoke of Greece and Italy, two ancient centres of culture like India, and the fight for freedom by the Irish, subject to servitude under a common master, deeply stirred the emotion of the Indians, and evoked feelings of nationalism of the same type. The visit of Indians to Europe in increasing numbers contributed to the same end by making them familiar with the nationalist movements and the working of the free political institutions of Europe.

The introduction of printing press was another important factor. The growth of vernacular literature and the important role it played in the political education of the people has been mentioned in Chapter V. The printing press made the books accessible to a large number of people and stimulated their interest. The printing press also facilitated the growth of periodical literature which was a powerful factor in the development of nationalistic ideas.[4] The opening up of communication between distant parts of India by the introduction of railways, post and telegraph also helped the cause of Indian nationalism by developing the sense of unity among the diverse peoples of the great sub-continent.

Apart from these important factors, the spirit of nationalism was intensified by the growing volume of discontent and disaffection against the British rule due to a variety of causes mentioned above.[4a] The grinding poverty of the people, punctuated by periodical famines, was naturally ascribed to the British policy of destroying Indian trade, industry and manufacture by unfair means dictated by the interest of their own country.[5] The galling distinctions between Indians and Europeans in the eye of the law, and the united opposition offered by the latter to the so-called "Black Acts" which sought to remove them, were bitterly resented by the Indian intelligentsia, and they were further estranged by the failure of the Government to concede even the most moderate demands for administrative reforms. The terrible tales of oppression by the indigo-planters, the haughty attitude of the English officials, the arrogant conduct of Englishmen towards Indians, not unoften resulting in brutal assaults and rupture of spleens of the latter, and the acquittal or very nominal punishment of the criminals with white skin by British Judges, produced an intense anti-British feeling among all classes of people which fed the current of national feeling among Indians.[6]

There were many other contributory causes. Among these may be mentioned the effect of the outbreak of 1857-8. There is no doubt that the social and political relations between the Indians and the British, bad as they were before, grew much worse owing to that event,[7] and thus it indirectly helped the growth of national feeling. But it is a moot point to decide how far the mutiny or revolt of 1857-8 directly stimulated the growth of such a feeling. For the nationalistic feeling first appeared among the intellectuals who were, generally speaking, indifferent and even unsympathetic, if not positively hostile, to the movement, and were not therefore likely to be affected by it.[8]

It is in Bengal, which was least affected by the incidents of 1857-8, that we find the distinct growth of a truly nationalist movement during the sixties, i.e. almost immediately after the suppression of the outbreak of 1857-8. It was not directed towards the advancement of political status or the achievement of administrative reforms, but it had a higher aim, namely, the regeneration of Indians on the basis of a true conception of nationality.

One of the important factors in the development of nationalism in Bengal was the new movement in Brāhma Samāj, initiated by Keshab-chandra Sen, which carried one step further the ideal of freedom not only in respect of religious ideas—which was already developed by the older section—but also in social ideas and personal conduct. B. C. Pal, who was intimately connected with this movement, thus refers to it:

"The Brahmo Samaj, under Keshub Chunder Sen, had proclaimed a new gospel of personal freedom and social equality, which reacted very powerfully upon this infant national consciousness and the new political life and aspirations of young Bengal. Keshub's controversies with the Christian missionaries were widely read and greatly enjoyed not only by his own followers and co-religionists but by the entire body of our English-educated countrymen. In his victories over the Christian missionaries in these controversies, Keshub's countrymen, even outside his church and community, felt a genuine pride, which powerfully fed their national conceit. Keshub's English visit and the way he was lionised by the British public and the British press also reacted very powerfully upon the mind of his people in India. The old paralyzing sense of superiority of their new political masters over them was visibly replaced by a new self-confidence in our educated countrymen in consequence of Keshub's successful missionary propaganda in England."[9]

The all-India tour of Keshab also fostered the ideas of national unity by bringing together on a common platform diverse peoples of India in different regions. He was the first great all-India figure symbolising the unity of Indian culture. This was proved beyond doubt by the high regard in which he was held all over India—a fact strikingly demonstrated after his death. Sir Henry Cotton justly remarks: "The death of Keshub Chunder in January, 1884, was one of the earliest occasions for the manifestation of a truly national sentiment in the country. The residents of all parts of India, irrespective of caste and creed, united with one voice in the expression of sorrow at his loss and pride in him as member of one common nation".[9a]

But great as were the services of Keshab-chandra, his contribution to the growth of nationalism was both limited and indirect. In the first place, his appeal was "exclusively to the religious and moral sensibilities of the rising generations",[10] and he deliberately eschewed politics. "If anything, Keshab's politics accepted the British subjection of India as due to the intervention of God's special Providence for the salvation of India", and he openly proclaimed "loyalty to the British Government" as an article of the creed of his church.[10a] Secondly, he derived his inspiration soley from the West, and his leanings towards Christianity were such that not only Christian missionaries hoped, but the Indians also feared, that he would ere long embrace Christianity. Whatever we might think of this popular impression, there is no doubt that Keshab's theology was "built partly upon the Intuitionalist school of European philosophy and partly upon Carlyle's *Hero Worship* and Emerson's *Representative Men.*[11] For these reasons as well as the new doctrinal developments and other personal affairs, Keshab and his church steadily lost popular sympathies. "In fact, Keshub Chunder had almost as many detractors among young Bengal of his day as he had admirers."[12]

At this crisis of our national life, "when Keshub and his progressive Brahmos developed unmistakable tendencies towards the modern European or Christian ethics and rationalism,"[12a] the tide was turned by Rajnarain Bose,[13] himself a product of the Western education. He boldly proclaimed "the superiority of Hindu religion and culture over European and Christian theology and civilization."[14] The Hindus, said he, had forgotten their past to such an extent that they had no recollection of the fact that rational thinking and ideas of social and personal freedom were not wanting in the history of their own culture. Rajnarain Bose boldly asserted that "not only have we the most perfect system of theism or monotheism in our ancient theology and religion, but Hinduism presented also a much higher social idealism, all its outer distinctions of caste notwithstanding, than has as yet been reached by Christendom".[15] How far his views were historically correct, we need not discuss in the present context. It will suffice to state that these ideas were catching and his clarion call rallied round his banner a large number of Hindus who accepted his views with enthusiasm, and probably without argument or discussion. Rajnarain held before them a complete ideal of nationalism to be realised in every department of life. He gave a concrete picture of his ideas in a prospectus which he issued in 1866 with a view to the establishment of a "Society for the Promotion of National Feeling among the Educated Natives of Bengal".

The following extracts from this Prospectus sufficiently illustrate his ideas, though the whole document deserves a careful study.[16]

"Now that European ideas have penetrated Bengal, the Bengalee mind has been moved from the sleep of ages. A restless fermentation is going on in Bengalee Society. A desire for change and progress is everywhere visible. People discontented with old customs and institutions are panting for reform. Already a band of young men have expressed a desire to sever themselves at once from Hindu Society and to renounce even the Hindu name. It is to be feared that the tide of revolution may sweep away whatever good we have inherited from our ancestors. To prevent this catastrophe and to give a national shape to reforms, it is proposed that a Society be established by the influential members of native society for the promotion of national feeling among the educated natives of Bengal. Without due cultivation of national feeling no nation can be eventually great. This is a fact testified to by all history.

"The Nationality Promotion Society shall first of all use their best endeavours to revive the national gymnastic exercises...The Nationality Promotion Society shall establish a Model School for instruction in Hindu Music....The Nationality Promotion Society shall also establish a school of Hindu Medicine, where Hindu Materia Medica and practice of physic will be taught freed from the error and absurdities that disfigure them...The teacher of the proposed Hindu School of Medicine should be one who is acquainted with both English and Hindu Medical Sciences.

"The Nationality Promotion Society will publish in Bengalee the results of the researches of the Sanskrit scholars of Europe in the department of Indian Antiquities, giving special prominence to their description of prosperity and glory of Ancient India, physical, intellectual, moral, social, political, literary and scientific....

"The Nationality Promotion Society shall afford every encouragement in their power to the cultivation of Sanskrit. It shall patronize the publication of important Sanskrit works, co-operating with the Asiatic Society of Bengal in this respect, and shall offer pecuniary reward or panegyrical addresses to the best Sanskrit scholars of Bengal.

"The Nationality Promotion Society shall make it binding upon its members to ground the knowledge of their sons in their mother-tongue before giving them an English education. Education both in Bengalee and English, if carried on simultaneously, does great injury to the Bengalee education of a student, as he pays greater attention to the English than to the Bengalee language...

"The Nationality Promotion Society shall try its best to prevent daily increasing corruption of the colloquial language of the educated natives who mix, in common conversation, English words with Bengalee in the most ridiculous manner imaginable....

"The Nationality Promotion Society shall endeavour to prevail upon their countrymen to hold in the Bengalee language the proceedings of such societies as do not require the co-operation of Englishmen, and are exclusively composed of Bengalees, or have not as their object the improvement of youth in English speaking or writing...

"The Nationality Promotion Society shall publish tracts in Bengalee containing proofs of the existence of liberal and enlightened customs in Ancient India, such as female education, personal liberty of females, marriage by election of the bride, marriage at adult age, widow-marriage, inter-marriage, and voyage to distant countries. It will try to introduce such foreign customs into educated society as have a tendency to infuse national feeling into the minds of its members such as that of holding festivities in honour of men of genius as is done amongst European nations... The Nationality Promotion Society shall, in a few words, try, firstly, to prevent the introduction of evil foreign customs into educated native community; secondly, to introduce such foreign customs as have a tendency to infuse national feeling into the minds of its members; thirdly, to give, if possible, to foreign customs already introduced a national shape; fourthly, to aid social reformation by citing old precedents in its favour; and fifthly, to prevent the abolition of such old customs of the country as are beneficial in their nature.

"The Nationality Promotion Society will not overlook even such trifling points as the regulation of etiquette, with a view to give a national shape to the same. It would be impossible to abolish all foreign modes of etiquette that have crept into educated native society, such as the hearty handshake, but the members of the Nationality Promotion Society shall give the preference to our national *numuskar* and *pranam* on all occasions on which it is practicable to do so. . . .

"It would be the duty of the Nationality Promotion Society to reprobate the practice of frequenting European hotels so common among our educated countrymen. This practice shows a greedy hankering after European food, and demeans us in the eyes of foreigners. It must appear ridiculous in the eyes of all Europeans except hotel-keepers."

The ideas preached by Rajnarain Bose in this remarkable document were enthusiastically taken up by a young man named Naba-gopal Mitra, editor of the *National Paper* founded by Devendra-nath Tagore in 1865. He started an institution known as "Hindu Melā" to promote the national feelings, sense of patriotism, and a spirit of self-help among the Hindus. It was an annual public gathering on the last day of the Bengali year. The special features of the annual gathering were patriotic songs, poems and lectures, a detailed review of the political, social, economic, and religious condition of India, an exhibition of indigenous arts and crafts, and performance of different forms of physical exercises and feats of physical strength. It had an all-India outlook and specimens of arts and crafts were collected from Banaras, Kashmir, Jaipur, Lakhnau, and Patna. Rewards were also offered for good books written in Bengali and Sanskrit, which were calculated to promote the welfare of the country. Thus intellectual development through fine arts and literature, and economic progress by means of industrial development formed the main planks of the Hindu Melā.

The Hindu Melā met altogether fourteen times from 1867 to 1880. Its importance gradually declined owing to the establishment of other associations more directly connected with the political and national movement in Bengal. But it is impossible to overestimate the importance of its contribution to the growth of national feeling in Bengal. The patriotic songs and poems, sung and recited in this Melā, including one or two by Rabindra-nath, then a boy of 18, are still regarded as treasures of Bengali literature.

An association, called the 'National Society', was founded after the fourth session of the Melā. Its avowed object was the promotion of unity and national feeling among the Hindus. The National Society arranged a monthly discourse. In one of these monthly meetings, presided over by Devendra-nath Tagore, Rajnarain Bose delivered an address on the "Superiority of Hinduism" embodying his main views as mentioned above. . . It evoked a keen controversy, and meetings were held not only by Christians but also by advanced Brāhmas to oppose his views. As the Melā was confined to the

Hindus, objection was taken to the use of the word 'National'. Against this, the *National Paper,* the organ of the Melā, observed as follows:

> "We do not understand why our correspondent takes exception to the Hindus who certainly form a nation by themselves, and as such a society established by them can very properly be called a National Society."

This was not an isolated expression of views, casually formed, but rested on a deep-seated conviction which, at first confined to a small section, was gradually imbibed, consciously or unconsciously, by a large majority of educated people.

Naba-gopal elaborated his view of Hindu nationalism through his writings. This has been summed up as follows: "Nabagopal holds that the chief criterion of nationalism is unity. This unity, according to him, is brought about, sustained and promoted in different peoples by different means and on different principles. The principle which promoted nationalism amongst the Greeks was love of country, amongst the Jews the Mosaic Law, amongst the Romans the love of liberty and renown, and amongst the English the love of liberty. He maintains that the basis of national unity in India has been the Hindu religion. 'Hindu nationality is not confined to Bengal. It embraces all of Hindu name and Hindu faith throughout the length and breadth of Hindustan; neither geographical position, nor the language is counted a disability. The Hindus are destined to be a religious nation".[17]

But, side by side with the idea of Hindu nationalism, there was a broader outlook which sought to embrace the whole of India in one nationality. Indeed, this was a dominant and characteristic feature of nationalism in Bengal even at the very beginning, and was never lost sight of throughout the chequered course of its evolution. The school represented by Naba-gopal Mitra was at first insignificant, but gradually gained strength for reasons discussed later.

The contribution of the Brāhma Samāj to the development of nationalism, after Keshab-chandra Sen, cannot be regarded as very significant. Nevertheless, the founders of the third Samāj, notably Shiva-nath Sastri and Ananda-mohan Bose, in their personal capacities did much to further its cause. Reference will be made to A. M. Bose in connection with the growth of political organization discussed in the next chapter. B. C. Pal, an eminent political leader of Bengal at a later date, has preserved an interesting reminiscence of his close personal contact with Shiva-nath Sastri and the influence exercised upon him by the latter. Shiva-nath held that "freedom is one and indivisible", "political emancipation is impossible without social emancipation and personal purity". In all this he agreed with the current Brāhmaism. But he proceeded further and maintained that the realization of a man's spiritual destiny or his salvation was equally impossible unless the ideas of equality, liberty, and fraternity were fully organized in his personal life, his social relations, and in the constitution of his national State. To realize this completer ideal of freedom, a Society was organized by Shiva-nath in 1876. Its members were to take a pledge which was embodied in a formal document. The first article pledged the members to put up a strenuous fight against image-worship and caste-domination. The next article started with the declaration that "self-government is the only form of political government ordained by God." Logically interpreted, it meant that the British Government had no moral title to the allegiance of the people. But it was not a practical declaration of revolt, for the removal of social and religious evils must be the condition precedent to the reconstitution of the national State upon a truly democratic basis. Till then they should obey the laws of the present Government, but would not "take service under this Government." The next article discussed ways and means for advancing the country to the goal of self-government. This comprised education, including that of women and the masses, introduction of widow-remarriage, abolition of purdah, and other social reforms. Lastly, emphasis was laid on the development of physique and ability to defend the country. The signatories therefore pledged themselves to learn how to ride and shoot, and preach the duties of acquiring these military trainings and aptitudes to their fellow-countrymen.[18]

In spite of the fact that the actual achievement of this Society was very little or nothing, its idealism commands our attention. While the Brāhma Samāj confined its activities to the religious and ethical life to the exclusion of political life, and political leaders ignored or belittled the ethical and social aspects, Shiva-nath combined all of them in his ideal of complete freedom. To him belongs the credit of viewing religion as a formative force in worldly life in all its aspects, and also of bringing to our new patriotism and politics the inspiration of a lofty ethical ideal. Probably such an ideal was never preached again till we come to the days of Svāmī Vivekānanda and Mahātmā Gandhi.

Reference may be made to an innovation of Shiva-nath Sastri which signifies the change of spirit introduced by him. In the liturgy of Keshab-chandra Sen there was a prayer for universal humantiy. Shiva-nath, as a minister of Sādhāran Brāhma Samāj, replaced it by a special prayer, offered every week, for the uplift and emancipation of his own country and his people.[19]

The other religious movements also directly or indirectly helped the growth of nationalism. The Ārya Samāj founded by Dayananda gave a great impetus to nationalism in the Punjab. It imbued the people with a spirit of self-confidence. B. C. Pal, who witnessed the early stages of its development, has described it as follows:

"The fact of the matter is that the new generation of Hindus in the Punjab felt a keen humiliation in their inability to meet the attacks of Moslem and Christian propagandists, who condemned their religion as idolatry and polytheism. In the message of Pandit Dayananda they discovered, first, a powerful defensive weapon by which they could repudiate the claims to superiority of Christianity and Islam over their national religion. Dayananda. in the second place, did not only find a weapon of defence to the Punjab Hindu in his *Satyārtha-Prakāśa,* he made a violent attack on Christian and Moslem propaganda showing up the unreason of both these alien systems and exposing what he believed to be their moral lapses also. All this helped to feed the pride of the race of the Punjabee Hindu, who had previously found himself in a completely helpless position under the attacks of Christian and Moslem propaganda."[20]

As noted above, the Ārya Samāj was a militant sect from the very beginning. Its "chef inspiration came from its intense patriotism. This patriotism has always carried with it a spirit of intolerance of, if not virulent antagonism to, other religious systems, particularly the Moslem. Its attitude towards Christianity is not less hostile, though certainly not so open as it is towards Islam".[21] Ere long it developed an anti-foreign sentiment which was particularly strong among the younger section. "The young Arya Samajists openly declared that they were waiting for the day when they would settle their account both with Moslems and the Britishers."[22]

But the Ārya Samāj had also a positive approach to nationalism. "Political independence was one of the first objectives of Dayānanda. Indeed, he was the first man to use the term Swarāj. He was the first to insist on people using only swadeshi things manufactured in India and to discard foreign things. He was the first to recognize Hindi as the national language of India".[23] Whatever one might think of these claims put forward by the biographer of Dayananda,[24] there is no doubt that the Ārya Samāj aimed at the creation of an Indian nation by establishing a common religion and culture all over India. For this it adopted *Śuddhi* or reconversion into Hinduism of all those who had once renounced it, either willingly or under duress.

Similarly, a great impetus was given to nationalism by the Theosophical Society as well as by the great spiritual leader Ramakṛishṇa Paramahaṁsa and his disciple Svāmī Vivekananda, to which reference will be made later.

Though the spirit of nationalism was first evolved in Bengal it soon spread to other parts of India, but the positive evidence afforded by contemporary records is not as adequate or as easily available as in Bengal. In Bombay the writings and activities of Vishnu Krishna Chiplunkar, who died in 1882, Mahadev Govind Ranade, Gopal Ganesh Agarkar and Bal Gangadhar Tilak, as well as the ideas preached by Gopal Hari Desmukh and Bhaskar Pandurang Tarkhadkar, to whom reference has been made in the preceding chapter,[25] definitely indicate the growth of a strong national feeling. This is only what could be normally expected. For the people of Maharashtra occupied a high and honourable position in Indian politics even within living memory. Less than a century ago they had made a bold bid for political supremacy such as the British then enjoyed in India, and the last descendant of the Peshwas, though in exile, continued as a living symbol of their political glory and greatness till 1853.

For similar reasons the Muslims were also inspired by a national feeling from the very beginning of the British rule. But it was dominated by class consciousness at the very outset, as it was based solely on the memory of their political greatness and historical traditions, and not broadbased on those ideas of patriotism and nationalist feeling which the Hindus of Bengal imbibed through Western education. The nationalism of Maharashtra was saved from this narrowness by the influence of Western ideas, and was gradually merged into the widely developing Indian nationalism. As this nationalism was a product of English education, and the Muslims as a class lagged far behind the Hindus in taking advantage of it, there was a marked divergence in the growth of nationalism among the Hindus and Muslims. The Wahabi movement in the first half of the nineteenth century was a genuine national movement, but it was exclusively Muslim in character. On account of this Muslim exclusiveness and the greater influence of English education and Western ideas upon the Hindus, the Western type of nationalism, which was a characteristic feature of the political growth in India during the latter half of the nineteenth century, gradually partook more and more of a Hindu character. This process was hastened by the fact, mentioned above, that the past glory and greatness of the Hindus came to form the solid basis of this nationalism. This was quite natural, for in every country the memory of past greatness binds the people together into a national unity. But in India this historic consciousness operated upon the two major elements of the population, the Hindus and the Muslims, in diametrically opposite ways. Every historical incident in the past which reflected glory upon the one was a humiliating memory to the other. The triumphs of Muhammad ibn Qāsim, Sultan Maḥmūd of Ghaznī, and Muhammad Ghūrī which swelled the pride of the Muslims as a great conquering nation of the world, only evoked painful memories of national degradation and humiliation in the minds of the Hindus.

A very striking illustration of what has been stated above is afforded by the development of nationalism in Bombay. Here, too, as in Bengal, it was the English education that fostered the spirit of nationality as the people imbibed, along with Western culture, the love of freedom, the spirit of patriotism, the idea of self-government, the higher duty of self-sacrifice for the preservation of national honour and national liberty, and similar ideas which permeated Western literature, but were comparatively strangers to our own. Bal Gangadhar Tilak, the great nationalist leader of Bombay, gave expression to these ideas through his paper, the *Keśarī*. As far back as 1885 he wrote:

"We are, at present, gradually being inspired by the spirit of patriotism. The birth of patriotism among us is due to English rule and English education. English education has imparted to us knowledge of ancient and modern history; it has enabled us to know what were the fruits of patriotism among the ancient Greeks and Romans. We have also learned from their histories how, when they lost their patriotism, they were subjected to foreign domination and became ignorant and superstitious. English rule has made us realise the necessity of cultivating patriotism in our national concerns.....The spirit of patriotism has not as yet permeated all classes. It is only those who have come under the influence of English education and begun to realise the defects of British administration that have been inspired by that spirit. Patriotism is not our national quality: it is the product of the influences to which we have been subjected after the introduction of British rule".

Tilak made it the great object of his life to diffuse the spirit of patriotism and nationalism among the masses. Two expedients adopted by him for this purpose were the inauguration of Shivāji festival and the transformation of the traditional worship of Gaṇapati into an altogether new form. Thus he requisitioned to the national service two of the great forces which are calculated to deeply stir the national mind, namely, religion and history. But both the institutions produced diametrically opposite effects upon the Hindus and

Muslims. The images of Hindu gods have always excited the Muslims with iconoclastic fury, and their traditional rôle in Indian history has been to break them to pieces rather than make them serve any national purpose. Even though bereft of any power to do any mischief, their religion forbade them to derive any good out of it. As Shivāji had founded the Maharashtra kingdom in the teeth of opposition from the most powerful Muslim Emperor in India, a festival in his honour was well calculated to inspire the masses in Maharashtra. But Shivāji and the Maratha power founded by him were rightly regarded by the Muslims as the main causes of the decline and downfall of the greatest Muslim Empire in India, and their national vanity was sure to be wounded by doing any honour to the great Maratha leader. As a matter of fact, though Tilak did yeoman's service to the cause of Indian nationalism, he was never forgiven by the Muslims for instituting the Shivāji festival. In Bengal also the new spirit of nationalism was gradually assuming a Hindu character. This first came into prominence in connection with the Hindu Melā whose founder definitely asserted that the Hindus formed a nation by themselves. This view, of course, did not go unchallenged, as the criticism of the use of the title 'national' by Hindu Melā, noted above,[26] clearly demonstrates. But the further progress of nationalism in Bengal leaves no doubt that it did not, or rather could not, shed its Hindu character, as a genuine pride in the old history and culture of the Hindus formed its very basis.

This is quite clear from the Bengali literature which made the greatest contribution to the development of national and patriotic feeling during the last quarter of the nineteenth century. The name of Bankim-chandra Chatterji stands foremost in this connection. His famous novel *Ānandamaṭh* contains the hymn *Bande Mātaram* which had been the national anthem of India up to 1947. During the long and arduous struggle for freedom from 1905 to 1947 *Bande Mātaram* was the rallying cry of the patriotic sons of India, and thousands of them succumbed to the *lāṭhi* blow of the British police or mounted the scaffold with *Bande Mātaram* on their lips. The main theme of the novel inspired the Bengali youths to supreme self-sacrifice during the hectic days of the *Swadeshi* movement. The central plot moves round a band of *sannyāsins,* called *santānas* or children, who left their hearth and home and dedicated their lives to the cause of their motherland. They woshipped their motherland as the Goddess Kālī;—they knew no other deity save the land of their birth, and no other religion except the service of their motherland. That is why they called themselves *santānas* or children (of the mother). In their temple they placed three images of the Goddess Kālī representing the motherland,—Mother that was, great and glorious in her majestic grandeur; Mother that is, wretched and grovelling in the dust; and the Mother that will be, in her pristine glory. No other Bengali book—or, for the matter of that, no book written in any language—so profoundly moved the Bengali youths save perhaps Sarat-chandra's *Pather Dābi*, written half a century later. The later novel was an emotional protest against the British rule, as the earlier one was, at least ostensibly, against the Muslim rule. This aspect of the *Ānandamaṭh* and the imagery of Goddess Kālī leave no doubt that Bankim-chandra's nationalism was Hindu rather than Indian. This is made crystal clear from his other writings which contain passionate outbursts against the subjugation of India by the Muslims. From that day set the sun of our glory—that is the refrain of his essays and novels which not unoften contain adverse, and sometimes even irreverent, remarks against the Muslims. The plots of some of his novels are based on historical fights between Hindus and Muslims, such as Bakhtyar Khalji's invasion of Bengal, Aurangzeb's fight with the Rajputs, etc., and his readers were never left in doubt as to where his sympathies lay. The following confession of the great Bengali leader, B. C. Pal, echoes the sentiment of every young Hindu reader of Bankim's novels:

> "*Durgesh-nandini* quickened my earliest patriotic sentiments. Our sympathies were all entirely with Birendra Singha, and the court-scene where the Moslem invader was stabbed through his heart by Vimala (widow of Birendra Singha) made a profound impression upon my youthful imagination."[27]

Bengali lyric poems of the period gave a clarion call to patriotism. Rangalal's famous Ode to Liberty is a notable instance. Its opening line, which has been in the mouth of every Bengali ever since, may be translated as follows: "Breathes there the man who would like to live, though shorn of liberty?" And this was put in the mouth of a Rajput fighting for his country against the Muslims. Nabin-chandra Sen, another famous poet of Bengal, wrote a long poem on the occasion of the visit of the Prince of Wales (future Edward VII) to India. He makes Mother India recount in stirring verses to her guest her lost glory of the past, and the heroic achievements of the Marathas, Sikhs, and her other children; but no mention is made of the Muslims. But the broad Western type of nationalism which embraced India as a whole, irrespective of creeds and communities, was also faithfully reflected in Bengali literature. The greatest name in the field is that of Hem-chandra Banerji whose national lyrics, now become almost classic, drew a lurid picture of the Indians as contrasted with the Chinese and even the "uncivilized Japanese", who were free nations while India was asleep. The burthen of his poems was a passionate appeal to India to awake and arise. His brilliant satires on the Anglo-Indian agitation against the Ilbert Bill and the presentation of the ladies of his family to the Prince of Wales by a Bengali gentleman of Calcutta were really strong appeals to the national sentiments and feeling of self-respect of the Indians.

B. C. Pal describes as follows Hem-chandra's influence upon him:—

"Hem Chandra, however, was our special favourite. The intense patriotic passion that breathed through his poems captured our youthful minds in a way which no other Bengalee poems had done. The new generation of English-educated Bengalees had already commenced to advance themselves to positions of trust and responsibility in the new Administration. In the learned professions of law and medicine, also, they were gradually asserting themselves as against the British members. A new spirit of independence and self-assertion was increasingly manifesting itself in the conduct and conversations of the English-educated Bengalee. All these had already commenced to provoke a racial conflict in the country. Hemchandra was, in a special sense, the poet of this new conflict and of the new racial self-respect and sensitive patriotism, born of it."[28]

The new-born patriotism and national sentiments found expression in, and were deeply stimulated by, a number of beautiful national songs which have survived to the present day. The Bengali dramas and the public stage also played a great part in fostering the national sentiments. There were social dramas written with the deliberate object of drawing pointed attention to the many social evils which were eating into vitals of the nation, for in those days "a new passion for freedom,—personal, social, and political—had possessed the Bengali mind."[29] But there were also dramas with a distinctly national appeal. Reference may be made to the *Bhārata-mātā* (Mother India) which proclaimed the gospel of the religion of motherland. The following specimen of songs in this drama illustrates the anguish of a patriot's heart which it was the deliberate design of the author to evoke:

"O India, gloomy is thy face,
    Beautiful that was as the moon;
Tears flow from thine eyes
    Throughout the day and night."[30]

Some of the worst evils of the British rule which deeply stirred the feelings of the people formed the theme of dramas. The best illustration is the *Nīla-darpaṇa* by Dina-bandhu Mitra which depicted the terrible oppression of the indigo-planters.[31] B. C. Pal writes in his autobiography:

"When it was put upon the board of the new Bengalee theatres, the audience got wild with passion against the White Planters; and sometimes they so far forgot themselves that they threw their shoes at the poor actor on the stage."[32]

In general, the Bengali dramas, unable, on account of press laws, to portray directly sentiments and actions against the British, took resort to a subterfuge. They either portrayed heroic historical fights by the Rajputs against the Muslims who invaded or conquered their motherland, or invented purely imaginary pictures of struggle against foreign rulers or conquerors. The scenes and speeches and actions were devised in such a manner that no spectator was under any illusion as to the real objective.

The glaring evils of the British rule were overtly or covertly emphasised in poems, dramas, novels, and songs. Reference may be made to one particular national song which was an "open condemnation of foreign economic exploitation. The burthen of it was that India was becoming poorer and poorer every day owing to the loss of her national freedom." It was taken from a novel by Manmohan Bose, *Baṅgādhipa-parājaya,* depicting the conquest of Bengal by a foreign people who came from a high island on the sea called Tuṅgadvīpa. "The weaver and the blacksmith are crying day and night. They cannot find their food by plying their trade. Even threads and needles come from distant shores. Even match-sticks are not produced in the country. Whether in dressing themselves or producing their domestic utensils or even in lighting their oil-lamps,—in nothing are the people independent of their foreign masters...... Swarms of locusts from Tuṅgadvīpa coming to these shores have eaten up all its solid grains leaving only the chaff for the starving children of the soil."[33]

Among the important factors that contributed to the development of patriotic and national feelings must be reckoned the activities of some great personalities. The chief among these, during the period under review, was undoubtedly Surendra-nath Banerji.

Dismissed from Indian Civil Service for what is now generally regarded as a very minor offence of technical character, Surendranath had proceeded to England to appeal to the higher authorities. He failed in his mission, but during his stay in England he had made a special study of the history of the national movements in Europe and realized the important role played by young men in these movements. In particular the "Young Italy" movement by

Mazzini made a deep impression upon him. Surendra-nath joined the Calcutta Students' Association founded by Ananda-mohan Basu, and soon became the life and soul of it. B.C. Pal, himself a student in those days, has recorded his impression as follows. "Surendra Nath's eloquence and burning patriotism lent to it a new strength and inspiration. Surendra Nath's first appearance on the platform of the Students' Association at once established his claims to the leadership of a new youth movement."[34]

The subject of Surendra-nath's first lecture was the rise of the Sikh power in the Punjab. This and several other eloquent lectures that followed made Surendra-nath the leader of a new political movement, which practically supplanted the new religious movement of Keshab-chandra Sen which had hitherto caught the imagination of Young Bengal. The spirit of freedom which had been dominating the educated intelligentsia of Bengal was largely diverted from religious and social spheres and "Surendra Nath found a new and larger scope for its fulfilment in the political propaganda which he initiated."[35] It was nothing short of a silent but powerful revolution in the intellectual atmosphere in Bengal which gave a great stimulus to the newly awakened sense of national and patriotic fervour.

At this distance of time, with the situation so profoundly changed, it is difficult to assay properly the value of the inspiring addresses of Surendra-nath. For what really matters is not so much the logic of arguments, or the accuracy of facts in the light of what we know today, but the effect it produced on the impressionable minds of the young men who listened to them, and the activities which they stirred up. Fortunately, there is a first-hand record of these impressions by one who was a student in those days but later became a distinguished nationalist leader, viz. Bipin-chandra Pal. The following is an extract from his autobiography.

"The materials for his lecture on the 'Rise of the Sikh Power' were, no doubt, drawn from English sources, particularly from Malcolm's History of the Sikhs. But the Sikh movement was practically unknown to us. Our school text-books on Indian History did, no doubt, notice the story of the Sikhs in connection with Ranjit Singh. But these references had no inspiration for us. Surendra Nath for the first time presented the Sikh movement as really a movement of freedom, first, against the current ceremonialism and Brahminical domination of the Hindu community; second, against the oppression of the Moguls, who tried to crush a movement of religious and spiritual freedom by the organised brute force of an alien Government; and lastly, against British aggression. British historians of the Sikhs had glossed over the wonderful military skill and valour of the Sikh army, describing signal defeats of the British as draws, and what were really draws as defeats of the Sikhs. Surendra Nath in his address on the 'Rise of the British Power in the Punjab' exposed the unreliable character of British historians and painted in burning words the justice of the Sikh cause, the deathless devotion of the Sikh people to their *Khalsa* or Commonwealth, and the signal defeats which they inflicted on the British at Chilianwala and Gujerat. Our school histories never confessed frankly these defeats. This revelation of the history of the Sikhs made a very powerful appeal to our infant patriotism and lent new strength and even bitterness to the anti-British feeling that had already commenced to possess our youthful minds. I was not present at this first lecture of Surendra Nath's, but those who were, carried with them from this meeting a new patriotic fervour. A friend characterised this lecture of Surendra Nath's as creating, by deafening rounds of applause that followed in quick succession his rapidly flowing periods, almost a literal storm about College Square. Surendra Nath's position as the most powerful orator of his generation was at once established by this performance."[36]

"But the greatest and the most inspiring message of Surendra Nath's early propaganda was delivered through his lectures on Joseph Mazzini and the Young Italy movement organised by him. Mazzini's life and particularly his extremely sensitive patriotism which so worked upon his youthful imagination that even as a school boy he refused to join in any form of gaiety of his family and his community, in the face of the bondage in which his country lay under Austrian domination, drew out all the latent passion for national freedom in us. The tyrannies of the Austrian army of occupation in Italy, who showed scant regard for the ordinary rights and liberties of the Italian people and treated even the Italian intellectuals of the middle class as membrs of an inferior race, indeed literally as helots and slaves, made a profound impression upon our sensitive minds. Neither the person nor the property of the Italian in the neighbourhood of the Austrian military camps, nor even the honour of their women, were safe from the wanton insults and outrages of Austrian officers and soldiers. We saw or imagined a great similitude between the position of the Italians under Austrian domination and our own position under British rule. In the outlying districts in cases between Europeans and Indians the latter could hope to receive practically no justice. The differential treatment accorded to Indians and Europeans even when they happened to be members of the same Covenanted Civil Service rankled in our heart. The plight of the indentured labourers in the tea gardens of Assam had already commenced to be agitated in our vernacular press. The *Amrita Bazar Patrika* was circulating broadcast tales of magisterial high-handedness all over the province. All these things working upon our youthful imagination created a profound sympathy in us with the struggle for national freedom in Italy led by Mazzini, when the story was presented to us by Surendra Nath."[37]

Another effect of Surendra-nath's lecture on Mazzini, although little noticed at the time, and less known in later days, was big with future consequences. The familiarity of young Bengalis with the Young Italy movement led to the growth of secret political societies. Here also let Bipin-chandra Pal speak of his own youthful days:

"We commenced to read the writings of Mazzini and the history of the Young Italy movement. Here we saw also the earlier organisations for Italian freedom, particularly those of the Carbonari, with which Mazzini had himself been associated at the beginning of his patriotic career. The Carbonari were secret societies. They hoped to win their national freedom by covering the whole country with a network of secret revolutionary organisations, whose idea was to free their fatherland from the Austrian yoke by striking at the Austrian rulers. Secret assassinations were the main objective of these Carbonari organisations... But though without any real revolutionary motive or any plan of secret assassinations as the way to national emancipation, the new inspiration imparted to Young Bengal by Surendra Nath's presentation of the life of Mazzini and the Italian freedom movement led many of us to form secret organisations. Calcutta student community was at that time almost honeycombed with these organisations. Secrecy has a strange fascination for youthful minds. And this was the real psychology of our *penchant* for these secret societies. Surendra Nath was himself, I think, the President of quite a number of these secret societies.......Surendra Nath's connection with quite a number of the new secret societies among the youthful intellectuals of Calcutta proved the unique confidence which he enjoyed of his young followers. Though without any serious plan or policy of political action aiming at the liberation of their people from the British yoke, these societies were, however, not lacking in seriousness. Their patriotism was serious, and how seriously they took it was seen in the vows and rituals of many of these societies. I knew of one such society, though I was not myself a member of it, whose initiatory rites were almost Masonic in some aspects. Every member of this society had to sign the pledge of membership with his own blood drawn at the point of a sword from his breast."[38]

These societies did not achieve any practical result by way of organising revolution or political assassinations. But they left a rich legacy in this respect to the next generation.

Surendra-nath's nationality was of the Western type and it was predominantly political and free from any Hindu bias. In a speech he delivered in 1878 he urged the young men of India to dedicate their lives to the good of their country and laid special emphasis on the unity among different creeds. Here are a few passages:

"Young men, your country expects great things from you. Now I ask, how many of you are prepared, when you have finished your studies at the College, to devote your lives, to consecrate your energies to the good of your country? (cries of "all," "all")..... There comes a time in the history of a nation's progress, when every man may verily be said to have a mission of his own to accomplish. Such a time has now arrived for India. The fiat has gone forth. The celestial mandate has been issued that every Indian must now do this duty, or stand condemned before God and man. There was such a time of stirring activity in the glorious annals of England when.... (refers to Hampden, Algernon Sidney, and the Seven Bishops)......

"It is not indeed necessary for us to have recourse to violence in order to obtain the redress of our grievances. Constitutional agitation will secure for us those rights and privileges which in less favoured countries are obtained by sterner means. But peaceful as are the means to be enforced, there is a stern duty to be performed by every Indian. And he who fails in that duty is a traitor before God and man....

"Three hundred years ago, in the Punjab, the immortal founder of Sikhism, the meek, the gentle, the blessed Nanak preached the great doctrine of Indian unity and endeavoured to knit together Hindus and Musulmans under the banner of a common faith. That attempt was eminently successful. Nanak became the spiritual founder of the Sikh Empire. He preached the great doctrine of peace and good will between Hindus and Musulmans. And standing in the presence of his great example we too must preach the great doctrine of peace and good will between Hindus and Musulmans, Christians and Parsees, aye between all sections of the great Indian Community.

......"In the name then of a common country, let us all, Hindus, Musulmans, Christians, Parsees, members of the great Indian Community, throw the pall of oblivion over the jealousies and dissensions of bygone times and, embracing one another in fraternal love and affection, live and work for the benefit of a beloved fatherland".[39]

The eloquence of Surendra-nath and the voice of many other leaders put this broad view of nationalism in the forefront of the young Indians, and it exercised great influence upon the political evolution of India.

The great leaders of Bengal had hitherto laid stress on social religious, and personal freedom. The emphasis of Surendra-nath's appeal was far more on political freedom. This constitutes his principal contribution to the regeneration of Bengal. He brought a new message and inspiration of political freedom and carried young Bengal with him. Bipin-chandra Pal, himself a Brāhma, admits that "Surendra Nath's political propaganda gathered a much larger following than that of the religious and social revolt of Keshub Chandra Sen and the Brahmo Samaj."[40]

Surendra-nath was not insensible to social reform, but he was against violent changes. "We must", he said, "so far as practicable, take the community with us, by a process of steady and gradual uplift, so that there may be no sudden disturbance or dislocation, the new being adapted to the old and the old assimilated to the new. That has been the normal path of progress in Hindu society through the long centuries."[40a]

Another great personality who advanced the cause of nationalism in India broadbased on the unity of all communities was Mahadev Govind Ranade (1842-1901). He held the office of a Subordinate Judge under the Government of Bombay and could not therefore take any active part in politics. But he devoted himself to the social and economic uplift of the country. In respect of social reform, as noted above,[41] he steered a middle course between the overzealous enthusiasts who would rather secede from the Hindu society than tolerate its evils, and the orthodox who would oppose any reform. Ranade made a deep study of the economic problems of India and advocated a vigorous policy of industrial and commercial development. In 1890 he inaugurated the Industrial Association of Western India. His life and activities were not so spectacular as those of Surendra-nath Banerji, but like the latter he greatly advanced the cause of nationalism in Bombay and inspired and initiated men like Gokhale to the service of the motherland.

Indian nationalism proved to be a dynamic force and gathered momentum as years rolled on. In general it may be said that the further development of nationalism was mainly due to the rapid expansion of those very influences which gave birth to it. Among these specific mention may be made of the English education and the consequent impact of Western culture, religious and social reforms, vernacular literature, press and periodical literature, and political associations and organisations, which have been dealt with separately in different chapters. The phenomenal development of the Bengali literature and its reaction on the development of nationalism has been sketched above. In the same way the rapid expansion of English education through the Universities established in 1857 served as a potent instrument for developing nationalist ideas on a very much wider scale than before. Bankim-chandra Chatterji, one of the earliest products of the Calcutta University, made a philosophical study of nationalism as an abstract idea. In his view nationalism consists of two essential elements: first, the identification of individual interest with that of a particular community, so that every individual regards the welfare of the community as his primary duty. The second is a grim determination on the part of the individual to promote the interest of his own community even when it clashes with that of another and can be safeguarded only by doing harm to other nations. Such a spirit might be good or bad, but historical examples show that only the nations inspired by it achieve greatness. The unification of Italy and Germany was pointed by Bankim-chandra as the result of such a spirit of nationalism, and nobody can possibly fail to understand that in all this abstract discussion his main objective was to draw the public attention to the case of India. This is rendered crystal clear when Bankim-chandra adds, that neither of the two elements of nationalism mentioned by him was ever present in India. This he seeks to prove by reference to the events of Indian history, and concludes that the ideas of independence and nationalism are new to India and have been taught to the Indians by the English. Tilak's searching analysis of the profound effect of English education on the growth of patriotism and nationalism, even so late as the eighties of the nineteenth century, has been quoted above. The great poet Rabindra-nath has described, in his inimitable way, the inspiration he received from the English literature in his younger days, i.e. in the seventies and eighties. Indeed any one who studies the Indian books and periodicals of the period cannot fail to be struck with the powerful force exerted upon Indian minds by the passionate outbursts for the ideals of human liberty and violent denunciations of despotism in all shapes and forms by poets like Wordsworth and Shelley, and in general by the writings, speeches, and activities of celebrated Englishmen. A vernacular paper in Bengal felt almost a religious reverence for the Englishmen. "It is their Wilberforces, Hampdens, Mills, Brights, Metcalfes, Macaulays, and hundreds of other great men, whose liberal principles have captivated us, and we have regarded them as the very model of morality, and hold them in veneration."

The last three decades of the nineteenth century also saw a remarkable growth of Indian-owned newspapers—daily and weekly, and both in English and vernacular—whose role in developing nationalism was very great indeed, and detailed reference to it has been made in Chapter VI. Growth of political associations, described in Chapter XII, and the development of nationalism acted and reacted upon each other. It is the growing sense of nationalism which led to the development of powerful political organizations, and these, in their turn, further stimulated the Indian nationalism and made it a political force which even the mighty British Government had soon to reckon with.

In addition to these powerful forces which worked from within, there were others supplied by current events in the history of the world. The defeat of Italy in Abyssinian War, the rise of Japan as a great power, and the defeat it inflicted upon a mighty European power like Russia, had a great repercussion upon Indians. All these shattered the myth of European invincibility in war against non-Europeans and infused in the heart of the Indians hope and faith in their own power. The early discomfitures of the British in the Boer War were hailed with delight in India, though the Boers were no friends of India, and probably hated the Indians even more than the British. Here, again, a minor power successfully defying the authority of Britain, served as an object-lesson to the Indians that they could also rely on their own strength. The Irish struggle for independence against the British also served as a great inspiration to the Indians.

While nationalism in India was making rapid strides, it received a great momentum from two special circumstances during the closing decade of the nineteenth century. The first was the degraded status and the miserable lot of the Indians who migrated to the British Colonies in South Africa, Australia and elsewhere, and were subjected to great hardships and disabilities by the Colonial Governments, to which a detailed reference will be made in Chapter XVII. Every Indian felt with bitter and poignant sorrow that such humiliating treatment of the Indians was possible only because they were a subject people and not an independent nation. This idea quickened the consciousness of the Indians to the great value of nationalism and independence.

The second circumstance, of far greater importance, was the meteor-like rise of Svāmī Vivekananda as a great Messiah, Reference has been made above[42] to his religious career, but he shone no less brilliantly as a great nation-builder. It is not possible here to describe in detail the manifold ways in which he contributed to the development of Indian nationalism, and only a brief outline must suffice. As mentioned above, he championed the cause of Hinduism in the great Parliament of Religions, held at Chicago in U.S.A. in 1893 in connection with the celebration of the 400th anniversary of the discovery of America by Columbus. There, in the presence of the representatives of all the religions from almost all the countries in the world, the young monk from India expounded the principles of Vedānta and the greatness of Hinduism with such persuasive eloquence that from the very first he captivated the hearts of the vast audience. It would be hardly an exaggeration to say that it was Svāmī Vivekananda who made a place for Hinduism in the cultural map of the modern world. The civilized nations of the West had hitherto looked down upon Hinduism as a bundle of superstitions, evil institutions, and immoral customs, unworthy of serious consideration in the progressive world of today. Now, for the first time, they not only greeted, with hearty approval, the lofty principles of Hinduism as expounded by Vivekananda, but accorded a very high place to it in the culture and civilization of the world. The repercussion of this on the vast Hindu community can be easily imagined. The Hindu intelligentsia were always very sensitive to the criticism of the Westerners, particularly the Christian missionaries, regarding the many evils and shortcomings of the Hindu society and religion, as with their rational outlook they could not but admit the force of much of this criticism. They had always to be on the defensive and their attitude was mostly apologetic, whenever there was a comparative estimate of the values of the Hindu and Western culture. They had almost taken for granted the inferiority of their culture *vis à vis* that of the West, which was so confidently asserted by the Western scholars. Now, all on a sudden, the table was turned, and the representatives of the West joined in a chorus of applause at the hidden virtues of Hinduism which were hitherto unsuspected either by friends or foes. It not only restored the self-confidence of the Hindus in their own culture and civilisation, but quickened their sense of national pride and patriotism. This was evident from the sentiment echoed and re-echoed in the numerous public addresses which were presented to Svāmī Vivekananda on his home-coming by the Hindus all over India, almost literally from Cape Comorin to the Himālayas. It was a great contribution to the growing Hindu nationalism.

On his return to India, Svāmī Vivekananda made it a mission of his life to preach the spiritual basis of Hindu civilization. He pointed out in his writings and speeches that the spirituality of India was neither less valuable, nor less important for the welfare of humanity, than the much vaunted material greatness of the West which has dazzled our eyes. He was never tired of asking the Indians to turn their eyes, dazed by the splendour of the West, to their own ideals and institutions. By careful comparison between the real values of the Hindu ideals and institutions and those of the West, he maintained the superiority of the former and asked his countrymen never to exchange gold for tinsels. Referring to the conflict between Westernized India and the true India of the old, he said: "On one side, New India is saying: 'If we only adopt Western ideas, Western language, Western food, Western dress and Western manners, we shall be as strong and powerful as the Western nations.' On the other, Old India is saying, 'Fools! By imitation, other's ideas never become one's own—nothing, unless earned, is your own. Does the ass in the lion's skin become the lion?'

"On one side, New India is saying: 'What the Western nations do are surely good, otherwise how did they become so great?' On the other side, Old India is saying: 'The flash of lightning is intensely bright, but only for a moment; look out, boys, it is dazzling your eyes. Beware!"

But Vivekananda was not prejudiced against the West, nor insensible to the great value of her achievements. He frankly admitted that Indian culture was neither spotless nor perfect,—it had to learn many things from the West, but without sacrificing its true character.

Svāmī Vivekananda combined in himself the role of a great saint and fervid nationalist. He placed Indian nationalism on the high pedestal of past glory, but it embraced the teeming millions of India, both high and low, rich and poor. He devoted his life to the awakening of national consciousness and many of his eloquent appeals would stir the national sentiments of India even today to their very depths. Here is one specimen:

"India!...Wouldst thou attain, by means of thy disgraceful cowardice, that freedom deserved only by the brave and the heroic? O India! forget not that the ideal of thy womanhood is Sītā, Sāvitrī, Damayantī; forget not that the God thou worshippest is the great ascetic of ascetics, the all-renouncing Śaṅkara, the Lord of Umā; forget not that thy marriage, thy wealth, thy life are not for sense-pleasure, are not for thy individual personal happiness; forget not that thou art born as a sacrifice to the Mother's altar; forget not that thy social order is but the reflex of the Infinite Universal Motherhood; forget not that the lower classes, the ignorant, the poor, the illiterate, the cobbler, the sweeper are thy flesh and blood, thy brothers. Thou brave one, be bold, take courage, be proud that thou art an Indian and proudly proclaim, 'I am an Indian, every Indian is my brother.' Say, 'The ignorant Indian, the poor and destitute Indian, the Brahman Indian, the Pariah Indian, is my brother.' Thou, too, clad with but a rag round thy loins proudly proclaim at the top of thy voice, 'The Indian is my brother, the Indian is my life, India's gods and goddesses are my God. India's society is the cradle of my infancy, the pleasure-garden of my youth, the sacred heaven, the Vārāṇasī of my old age.' Say, brother, 'The soil of India is my highest heaven, the good of India is my good.' and repeat and pray day and night, 'O Thou Lord of Gaurī, O Thou Mother of the Universe, vouchsafe manliness unto me. O Thou Mother of Strength, take away my weakness, take away my unmanliness, and—*Make me a Man*."[43]

Though an ascetic, Vivekananda was a patriot of patriots. The thought of restoring the pristine glory of India by resuscitating among her people the spiritual vitality which was dormant, but not dead, was always the uppermost thought in his mind. His great disciple, Sister Niveditā (an Irish lady named Margaret Noble), who was his constant companion, has remarked: "Throughout those years, in which I saw him almost daily, the thought of India was to him like the air he breathed." A saint and an ascetic have always exercised a profound influence upon Indian minds. No wonder, therefore, that the prophecy of Vivekananda that India, with all her shortcomings, and in spite of the present dismal outlook, shall rise to the stature of a great nation in the modern world, went home and quickened the national impulses of the people of India. There seems to be a great deal of truth in the following tribute paid to him by a recent historian of India's struggle for *Swaraj*:

> "Svāmī Vivekananda might well be called the father of modern Indian Nationalism; he largely created it and also embodied in his own life its highest and noblest elements."[44]

An important contribution to the growth of Indian nationalism, was also made by the Theosophical Society, to which reference has been made above.[45] Its effect on Indian mind is thus described by B. C. Pal:

> "This Society told our people that instead of having any reason to be ashamed of their past or of the legacies left to them by it, they have every reason to feel justly proud of it all, because their ancient seers and saints had been the spokesmen of the highest truths and their old books, so woefully misunderstood today, had been the repositories of the highest human illumination and wisdom. Our

people had hitherto felt perpetually humiliated at the sense of their degradation. This new message, coming from the representatives of the most advanced peoples of the modern world, the inheritors of the most advanced culture and civilisation the world has as yet known, at once raised us in our own estimation and created a self-confidence in us that commenced to find easy expression in a new propaganda which, instead of apologising for our current and mediaeval ideas and institutions and seeking to reform and reconstruct these after modern European ideals, boldly stood up in defence of them."[46] Elsewhere Pal says: "But the greatest contribution of Theosophy to the development of our national consciousness was in its new and strange gospel of Ancient Indian Wisdom and in its announcement of a great world purpose and world mission which India yet had for the races of the modern world."[47]

The most talented representative of the Society in India was Mrs. Annie Besant. Apart from revealing the past glory and greatness of the Hindus, she offered justification even for the many customs and institutions, which were generally tolerated by the educated Hindus though regarded by them as evil or superstitious and openly condemned as such. The justification of these customs and institutions by new interpretation of their significance and *raison d'être* from the pen of a talented European lady, noted for profound learning and wisdom, naturally flattered the wounded vanity of the Hindus, the pride in their national glory being further enhanced by her dictum, repeatedly asserted, that the Hindu culture was essentially superior to the European.

It has been pointed out above that the newly born Indian nationalism was gradually assuming a decidedly Hindu character. This received further stimulus from the activities of Vivekananda and the teachings of the Theosophical Society. The latter, in particular, gave it a tinge of orthodoxy which was disapproved by Vivekananda himself. Referring to the Theosophical Society he said, "foolish depreciation is surely vicious, but fulsome praise is equally loathsome."[47a] It was also disliked by a section of the nationalists. Nevertheless, towards the close of the nineteenth century, one could clearly distinguish a spirit of revivalism, i.e. an attempt to reconstruct the Hindu society on the model of the old.[48] This, as noted above, was strongly opposed by Mahadev Govind Ranade.[49]

But whatever one may think of this drawback, there is no doubt that patriotism was lifted to a high spiritual level by Svāmī Vivekananda. Although he was mainly a religious devotee, and a *sannyāsin* who had renounced the world, his speeches, writings and activities had a direct bearing on the devotion to motherland. He emphasized the greatness of the spiritual idea enunciated in the Vedānta, and the important role it was destined to play in elevating the whole mankind. But, he said, this great mission of India would remain unfulfilled so long as India continued in her present state of slavery and abject poverty. The political and material greatness of India was, therefore, indissolubly bound up with the spiritual regeneration of India and mankind. Vivekananda restated the old ideas of Vedānta in a new form. The fundamental concept of Vedānta was the essential unity of God and man and the realization of this truth by man by removing his illusion or ignorance. In the past, such realization was sought through metaphysical abstractions and renunciation of social and civic life. It is against this prevailing view that Vivekananda raised his voice of protest. Realization of God is to be achieved, said he, not by retirement into hills and forests and negation of wordly life, but by the spiritualization of the normal contents and actualities of life. He put it in a more concrete form by laying emphasis on the fact that one should not run away from the world in order to seek God, but try to recognize Him in his fellow-beings, who were the images of God Himself, as taught by the Vedānta. The true worship of God was the service of the people whom we have hitherto neglected or trodden under foot. He therefore asked every Indian to realize God in the nation and to dedicate himself to its service, in a spirit of religious reverence and without any pride or fear, irrespective of all earthly consequences. He gave a living touch to the idea by using the word *Daridra-Nārāyaṇa* i.e. the God symbolised by the poor and the humble. This great *sannyāsin,* who had left his hearth and home at the call of his spiritual *guru,* Śrī Rāmakṛishṇa, and delved deeply into spiritual mysticism, was never tired of preaching that 'what India needs today is not so much religion or philosophy, of which she has enough, but food for her hungry millions, social justice for the low classes, strength and energy for her emasculated people, and a sense of pride and prestige as a great nation of the world.'

Vivekananda put Indian nationalism firmly on the five bed-rocks, viz , yearning for political independence, pride in the past glory and greatness of India, unity of Indians on the conception of brotherhood, awakening of the masses, and development of physical strength and vigour. To a group of young men who met him, seeking his guidance and blessings, he said: "Man-making is my mission of life. You try to translate this mission of mine into action and reality. Read Bankimchandra and emulate his *deśabhakti* (patriotism) and *sanatāna-dharma* (activities of the band of patriots depicted in the *Ānanda-*

maṭha) Your duty should be service to motherland. India should be freed politically first." "For the next fifty years", he said elsewhere, "this alone shall be our key-note—this, our great Mother India. Let all other vain Gods disappear for that time from our minds".[49a]

Again and again Vivekananda asserted that weakness, real or fancied, has been the bane of Indian national life in the past. "What I want", said he, "is muscles of iron and nerves of steel, inside which dwells a mind of the same material as that of which the thunderbolt is made." Again, "First of all, our young men must be strong. Religion will come afterwards. Be strong, my young friends; that is my advice to you. You will be nearer to Heaven through football than through the study of the *Gītā*." But he held out the Kṛishṇa of the *Bhagavad-Gītā* as our national ideal of dynamic energy based on true religion.

The uplift of the masses seems to have been the key-note of his programme of national regeneration. "The only hope of India", he said, "is from the masses. The upper classes are physically and morally dead."

Again, he said, "Keep the motto before you—'Elevation of the masses'... Work among those young men who can devote heart and soul to this one duty—the duty of raising the masses of India.' Vivekananda put it in the forefront of his social programme. "Our modern reformers", said he, "are very busy about widow remarriage. Of course, I am a sympathiser of every reform, but the fate of a nation does not depend upon the number of husbands their widows get, but upon the condition of the masses."

Vivekananda made a trumpet call to all Indians to shed fear of all kinds and stand forth as men by imbibing *śakti* (energy and strength), and reminded them that they were the particles of the Divine, according to the eternal truth preached by the Vedānta.

As for himself, he was even prepared to forego his own salvation for the sake of the masses. "Who cares for your *Bhakti* and *Mukti*?", he once exclaimed, "I will go into a thousand hells cheerfully, if I can rouse my countrymen, immersed in *Tamas*, to stand on their own feet". "What I now want", he wrote in a letter in 1895, "is a band of fiery missionaries," and he gave a practical shape to the idea a few years later. In the Rules which he had himself drawn up for the Belur Maṭh, the centre of his organization, the last one runs as follows: "The root of all misery in India is the wide gulf between the lower and upper classes. Unless this difference is made up, there is no hope of any well-being for the people. Therefore we must send preachers to all places to give the masses education and religious teaching". In pursuance of this he engaged the monks recruited mostly from the educated middle class for social service under an allied, but distinct, organization known as the Rāmakṛishṇa Mission, whose activities extend throughout India. The precepts and example of this great *sannyāsin* galvanised the current of national life, infused new hopes and inspirations, and placed the service to the motherland on a religious level. His voice had a special appeal to the Indians as they are always attracted by a saintly life, more particularly as his teachings, inspired by Śrī Rāmakṛishṇa, were highly honoured even in Europe and America.

Svāmī Vivekananda thus gave a spiritual basis to Indian nationalism. The lessons of Vedānta and the *Bhagavad-Gītā* permeated the lives and activities of many a nationalist, and, as will be seen later, many a martyr, inspired by his teachings, endured extreme sufferings and sacrifices with a cheerful heart, fearlessly embraced death, and calmly bore the inhuman tortures, worse than death, which were sometimes inflicted upon them.

Not only religion and philosophy but also history was enlisted in the cause of nationalism. As Bengal had no knowledge in those days of her own great heroes, the lives of Rājput, Marāṭhā and Sikh heroes took their place. The patriotism of Rāṇā Pratāp and the heroic deeds of Shivāji were household words in Bengal. It would be difficult to find in any literature such stirring poems as Rabindranath wrote on Shivāji and the Sikh leaders Bāndā and Guru Govinda.

The ground was thus prepared in Bengal for the emergence of a mighty wave of nationalism which soon revolutionised the political movement in India. But it was in Maharashtra where the new spirit of nationalism first manifested itself in a practical form. This is best illustrated by the career of Wasudeo Balwant Phadke sketched above.[60]

Wasudeo Balwant Phadke set the example of militant nationalism which took deep root in the soils of Maharashtra and Bengal a quarter of a century later, as will be described in another chapter. His activities, however, had no immediate effect on the progress of nationalism as an ideal and motive force in political and social life, such as has been described above.

A review of the progress of nationalism in India was made by Gopal-krishna Gokhale in 1905, in the following passage: "The growth, during the last fifty years, of a feeling of common nationality, based upon common tradition, common disabilities and common hopes and aspirations, has been most striking. The fact that we are Indians first, and Hindoos, Mahomedans, Parsees, or Christians afterwards, is being realised in a steadily increasing measure, and the idea of a united and renovated India, marching onwards to a place among the nations of the world worthy of her great past, is no longer a mere idle dream of a few imaginative minds, but is the definitely accepted creed of those who form the brain of the community—the educated classes of the country."[51]

The most significant trait of the new nationalism was an intense love of the motherland, based on a conception of its past glory and future greatness. But it was often distinguished from patriotism of the Western type by being elevated to a religious level. This was clearly preached by Bankim-chandra in his famous novel *Ānandamaṭh,* to which reference has been made above. He has depicted therein the lives of a band of patriots who had left their hearth and home, wives and children, and dedicated their lives to the service of their motherland, conceived as the goddess Kālī, the source of all power and energy. The only form of worship acceptable to her was the selfless service to the motherland. They revered no other deity, and no other form of worship was known to them.[62] Thus Bankim-chandra converted patriotism into religion and religion into patriotism.

Gokhale tried to give a practical shape to this high ideal by founding the 'Servants of India Society' in 1905. While inaugurating it, he described the progress of nationalism in the extract quoted above, and then observed: "The results achieved so far are undoubtedly most gratifying, but they only mean that the jungle has been cleared, and the foundations laid. The great work of rearing the superstructure has yet to be taken in hand....One essential condition of success is that a sufficient number of our countrymen must now come forward to devote themselves to the cause in the spirit in which religious work is undertaken. Public life must be spiritualised. Love of country must so fill the heart that all else shall appear as of little moment by its side. A fervent patriotism which rejoices at every opportunity of sacrifice for the motherland, a dauntless heart which refuses to be turned back from its object by difficulty or danger, a deep faith in the purpose of Providence that nothing can shake,—equipped with these, the worker must start on his mission and reverently seek the joy which comes of spending oneself in the service of one's country."

The object of the 'Servants of India Society' was to train such men—men who would be "prepared to devote their lives to the cause of the country in a religious spirit", and, "as national missionaries," promote "by all constitutional means the national interests of the Indian people." Every member of the Society had to take seven vows at the time of admission. The first four of these are: (1) That the country will always be the first in his thoughts and he will give to her service the best that is in him. (2) That in serving the country he will seek no personal advantage for himself. (3) That he will regard all Indians as brothers, and will work for the advancement of all, without distinction of caste or creed. (4) That he will be content with such provision for himself and his family, if he has any, as the Society may be able to make. He will devote no part of his energies to earning money for himself.

---

1. See p. 338.
2. *Bengal Past and Present,* LXVII (1948), pp. 40-5.
3. "If I were asked under what sky the human mind has most fully developed some of its choicest gifts, has most deeply pondered on the greatest problems of life, and has found solutions of some of them which well deserve the attention even of those who have studied Plato and Kant—I should point to India. And if I were to ask myself from what literature we, here in Europe, we who have been nurtured almost exclusively on the thoughts of Greeks and Romans, and of one Semitic race, the Jewish, may draw that corrective which is most wanted in order to make our inner life more perfect, more comprehensive, more universal, in fact more truly human, a life, not for this life only, but a transfigured and eternal life—again I should point to India." F. Max Müller, *What Can India Teach Us?* 2nd Edn., Oxford, 1892, p. 6.
4. Cf. Ch VI.
4a. Cf. Ch. XI, and Vol. IX, Chs. XIII, XXIX.
5. Cf. Vol. IX, pp. 412 ff.
6. Ch. IX and the Chs. mentioned in f.n., 4a.
7. See pp. 349-51.
8. Vol. IX, Ch. XX; Griffiths, p. 259.
9. B.C. Pal-I, I. 229.
9a. Cotton-II, 222.
10. B.C. Pal-I, I. 233.
10a. Ibid, I. 315; II. XV.
11. Ibid, I. 237.
12. Ibid, 234.
12a. Ibid, 259-60.
13. This is the popular form of the name of Rāj-nārāyan Basu mentioned on p. 176.
14. Ibid, 260.
15. Ibid, 261-2.
16. The text of the Document is reproduced in the *Modern Review,* June, 1944, pp. 444 ff.
17. B. Majumdar, 293-4.
18. B.C. Pal-I, I. 310-14.
19. B. C. Pal-II, 66.
20. B.C. Pal-I, II. 70-1.
21. Ibid, 84.
22. Ibid, 85.
23. H.B. Sarda—*Dayananda,* p. cxxii.
24. It may be noted that Keshab-chandra Sen and Bhudev Mukherji recommended Hindī as national language, and several others recommended ***swadeshi,*** before Dayānanda.
25. See pp. 456 ff.
26. See pp. 472-3.
27. B.C. Pal-I, I. 227.
28. Ibid, 228.
29. Ibid, 252.
30. Ibid, 256.
31. Cf. Vol. IX, pp. 917, 922, 933.

32. B.C. Pal-I, I, 253.
33. Ibid, 256. I have substited 'Tuṅgadvīpa', the original word, for 'a distant island' in Pal's translation.
34. Ibid, 233.
35. Ibid, 237-8.
36. Ibid, 242-3.
37. Ibid, 245-6.
38. Ibid, 246-48.
39. *Speeches and Writings*, 227-31.
40. B.C. Pal-I, I. 235.
40a. *A Nation in Making*, pp. 397-8.
41. See p. 256.
42. See pp. 123-31.
43. For the extracts quoted from the writings and speeches of Vivekananda, and others of similar import. cf. *Complete Works of Vivekananda*, IV (7th Ed.), pp.477-80; Bhupendranath Datta, *Swami Vivekananda*, pp. 314-42, 371-99; Eknath Ranade, *Swami Vivekananda's Rousing Call to Nation* (a compilation of select passages).
44. Pradhan, 60.
45. See pp. 131-4.
46. B.C. Pal-I, I. 425.
47. Ibid, II LV.
47a. *Complete Works of Vivekananda*, Vol. IV (7th Ed.). p. 318.
48. See pp. 115-6.
49. See pp. 257-8.
49a. Complete Works, III (8th Ed.), 300-01.
50. Cf. Vol. IX, pp. 908-14.
51. *Speeches of Gokhale*, Appendix, pp. 182-4.
52. See pp. 257-8.

CHAPTER XIV (LII)

DEVELOPMENT OF POLITICAL IDEAS AND ORGANIZATIONS (1858-85)

I. BENGAL

As an inevitable consequence of the growth of nationalism, described in the preceding chapter, there was a forward movement in political ideas and organizations in the latter half of the nineteenth century. Hitherto the political aspirations of the Indians did not go much beyond administrative reforms with a view to giving more powers to the Indians, but gradually they were inspired by higher ambitions to which expression has been given by Surendra-nath Banerji in the following passage: "It was not enough that we should have our full share of the higher offices, but we aspired to have a voice in the councils of the nation. There was the bureaucracy. For good or evil, it was there. We not only wanted to be members of the bureaucracy and to leaven it with the Indian element, but we looked forward to controlling it, and shaping and guiding its measures and eventually bringing the entire administration under complete popular domination. It was a new departure hardly noticed at the time, but fraught with immense potentialities. Along with the development of struggle for place and power to be secured to our countrymen, there came gradually but steadily to the forefront the idea that this was not enough, that it was part, but not even the most vital part, of the programme for political elevation of our people. The demand for representative government was now definitely formulated, and it was but the natural and legitimate product of the public activities that had preceded it."[1]

The idea of a representative government was not, however, a new thing in Bengal politics. On July 25, 1867, W. C. Bonnerjee, who afterwards became the President of the first Indian National Congress (1885), delivered in England a long speech on "representative and responsible Government of India". He made the concrete suggestion of setting up a representative Assembly and a Senate in India with the power to veto their decisions given to both the Governor-General and the Crown.[2] In a speech at Brighton in March, 1873, Ananda-mohan Bose advocated the establishment of representative Government in India by gradual stages.

Next year, Krishta-das Pal, the veteran politician of Bengal, recommended a similar constitutional government for India. In 1874, in a leading article in the *Hindoo Patriot* on the "Home Rule for India", he observed: "Our attention should, therefore, be directed to Home Rule for India, to the introduction of constitutional government for India in India. Most of the British Colonies have been blessed with constitutional Government, but India is the only Dependency which, despite the vastness of its area, its population and interests, is denied the privilege. If taxation and representation go hand in hand in all British Colonies, why should this principle be ignored in British India?...Home Rule for India ought to be our cry, and it ought to be based upon the same constitutional basis that is recognised in the Colonies".[3]

The existing political associations did not prove equal to the task of pursuing this higher ideal, and so a few advanced political thinkers of Bengal started a new association called "Indian League" on 23 September, 1875. Its object was defined to be "to stimulate the sense of nationalism amongst the people" and awaken political consciousness among them. The organizers rightly claimed that "this is the first instance of a political body formed by public announcement and a call upon the nation to attend it and mould it to their liking".[4] Even the Anglo-Indian daily of Calcutta, the *Englishman,* referred to this new political organization as "the first marked sign of the awakening of the people on this side of India to political life".[5] The Indian League had a brief but useful career. It was shortly supplanted by another political organization which proved to be more durable. This new organization, promoted by several leaders of advanced political thought, headed by Surendra-nath, was inaugurated in a public meeting held at the Albert Hall, Calcutta, on 26 July, 1876, which was attended by about seven to eight hundred persons. The new organization was named 'Indian Association' for reasons which Surendra-nath himself explains as follows:

"The idea that was working in our minds was that the Association was to be the centre of an all-India movement. For even then, the conception of a united India, derived from the inspiration of Mazzini, or, at any rate, of bringing all India upon the same common political platform, had taken firm possession of the minds of the Indian leaders in Bengal. We accordingly resolved to call the new political body the Indian Association".[6] Surendra-nath also defines the object of this Association in the following words:

"(1) The creation of a strong body of public opinion in the country; (2) the unification of the Indian races and peoples upon the basis of common political interests and aspirations; (3) the promotion of friendly feeling between Hindus and Mohamedans; and, lastly, the inclusion of the masses in the great public movements of the day".[7]

The Indian Association was welcomed by all shades of public opinion. The well-known Indian paper of Calcutta, the *Hindoo Patriot,* the organ of the British Indian Association, which was opposed to the 'Indian League', welcomed it in words which show the new trend of political thought in the country.

"If they be less a petitioning body, and more an agency for the education of the rising generation in political matters, and for the direction of their political thoughts and aspirations through right channels, they may prove useful co-operators of the existing Associations. They cannot have a better model than the East Indian Association, which generally invites thoughtful men to discuss important questions, publishes the discussions for general information, and thus helps in the moulding and maturing of public opinion on those questions, and petitions to Parliament or Her Majesty's Government on exceptional occasions".[8]

Surendra-nath very rightly observes:

"The Indian Association supplied a real need. It soon focussed the public spirit of the middle class, and became the centre of the leading representatives of the educated community of Bengal".[9]

One of the important topics which engaged the attention of the Indian Association was the new regulation of 1876 reducing the age-limit of the competitors for the Indian Civil Service examination from 21 to 19. It was bound to prove a great handicap to Indian candidates, and was no doubt deliberately devised to reduce their chance of success. The Indian Association took up this question in right earnest and held a public meeting in Calcutta on 24 March, 1877, to enter an emphatic protest against it. In order to give an all-India character to the agitation, the Association had sent letters to the different provinces asking for their opinion, and letters and telegrams from the leaders of different regions of India, protesting against the reactionary measure, were read at the public meeting. This is the beginning of a novel feature in the political agitation of the country which soon became almost a normal procedure. Backed by the united voice of India, the Calcutta meeting decided to send a memorial to the British Parliament, protesting against the measure and praying that the maximum age-limit for the I.C.S. examination be raised to twenty-two years as was recommended by Lord Northbrook, the then Governor-General of India, and other eminent authorities, and that the examination be simultaneously held in London and one or more centres in India. This is the beginning of that demand for simultaneous I.C.S. examinations in India and England which continued throughout the nineteenth century.

Apart from the great importance of this question, the organizers of the meeting had other ulterior motives. The meeting was held ostensibly to protest against the age-limit of the I.C.S. examination, but as Surendra-nath puts it, "the underlying conception, and the true aim and purpose, of the Civil Service agitation was the awakening of a spirit of unity and solidarity among the people of India".[10] The meeting accordingly decided "to bring the various Indian provinces upon the same common platform (a thing that had never been attempted before), and to unite them through a sense of a common grievance and the inspiration of a common resolve".[11] Thus an ill-conceived administrative measure led to the organization of what may be justly regarded as the first political movement on an all-India basis.

The task of carrying out this higher purpose was entrusted to Surendra-nath, and he was appointed a Special Delegate to visit the different parts of India. Surendra-nath discharged this onerous duty with great ability and industry. He left Calcutta on May 26, 1877, and made a prolonged tour in Upper India, visiting Banaras, Allahabad, Kanpur, Lakhnau, Aligarh, Delhi, Agra, Meerut, Amritsar and Lahore. Next year he made a similar tour in the Presidencies of Madras and Bombay. At all these places he addressed crowded public meetings which endorsed the resolutions passed at the public meeting in Calcutta. But he did something more. At Allahabad, Kanpur, Lakhnau, Meerut and Lahore he organized new political associations to act in concert with the Indian Association of Calcutta. The existing political organizations in other places also agreed to make a common cause. The foundation for concerted political action was thus well and truly laid.[12]

The propaganda tour of Surendra-nath Banerji from one end of India to the other constitutes a definite landmark in the history of India's political progress. It clearly demonstrated that in spite of differences in language, creed, and social institutions, the peoples of this great sub-continent were bound by a common tie of ideals and interest, creating a sense of underlying unity which enabled them to combine for a common political objective. For the first time within living memory, or even historical tradition, there emerged the idea of India over and above the congeries of States and Provinces into which it was divided.

This inner meaning of the tour of Surendra-nath impressed even discerning Englishmen of those days. Henry Cotton, a member of the I. C. S., but sympathetic to the political aspirations of India, thus describes his own impression at the time:

> "The educated classes are the voice and brain of the country. The Bengalee Babus now rule public opinion from Peshwar to Chittagong; and, although the natives of North-Western India are immeasurably behind those of Bengal in education and in their sense of political independence, they are gradually becoming as amenable as their brethren of the lower provinces to intellectual control and guidance. A quarter of a century ago there was no trace of this: the idea of any Bengalee influence in the Punjab would have been a conception incredible to Lord Lawrence, to a Montgomery, or a Macleod, yet it is the case that during the past year the tour of a Bengalee lecturer, lecturing in English in Upper India, assumed the character of a triumphal progress; and at the present moment the name of Surendra Nath Banerjee excites as much enthusiasm among the rising generation of Multan as in Dacca".[13]

To the Indian community the successful tour of Surendra-nath brought a new message of hope and inspiration. It demonstrated, among other things, that politics might be a subject of as absorbing interest as religion had hitherto been, that there was a far greater degree of sympathy and community of interest between the peoples of different provinces than was generally taken for granted, and that it was quite feasible to bring them together upon a common political platform in a common endeavour to improve the political condition of India. The stage was thus set for a political organization embracing the whole of India, which came into being in less than a decade. It was foreshadowed by the return visit of political leaders of Poona and the Punjab to Calcutta early in 1878.

The Indian Association found a new scope of activity in another reactionary measure of the Government. This was the Vernacular Press Act which was passed by Lord Lytton's Government.[14] Its object was to muzzle the newspapers in Indian languages which spread the message of nationality and the newly awakened sense of political consciousness. The venom of Government's wrath fell on Bengali papers, cuttings of which were sedulously collected to justify the new measure. It was generally believed at the time that the object of the Government was to stop the publication of the *Amrita Bazar Patrika*, an outspoken weekly edited by the famous Ghosh brothers, mentioned above.[15] The Vernacular Press Act was passed by the Supreme Council in one sitting on March 14, 1878. It was followed during the same year by other reactionary measures such as the Arms Act and the License Act.

The Indian Association held public meetings to protest against all these obnoxious measures and, in particular, carried on a vigorous agitation against the Vernacular Press Act which sought to cut at the very root of the nascent spirit of nationalism and political activity in India. As on the previous occasion of protest against the new I.C.S. regulation, a public meeting was held in Calcutta, intimations of which were sent to the other Provinces. This meeting, held in the Town Hall on 17 April, 1878, was attended by about five thousand men, and this was an indication of the growth in the political consciousness of the people. The British Indian Association held aloof, but all other shades of opinion were represented. Letters and telegrams supporting the object of the meeting were received from leaders and political associations all over India. Those who had discerning eyes could see in this meeting the transfer of the political leadership to the middle class intelligentsia from the old landed aristocracy and other vested interests.

The sequel of this meeting was of great political interest. A petition against the Vernacular Press Act was approved by the meeting and sent to the famous British statesman, Gladstone, who was then the Leader of the Opposition in the House of Commons. Gladstone moved a Resolution in the House which was fully debated. It was bound to be lost, but the amazing thing was that out of 360 members present, 152 members voted in favour of it.[16] In other words, it was definitely accepted as a party question. The Indian Association might well congratulate itself on the success achieved. Once more the whole of political India was united in a common effort, and the Indian point of view was presented before the British Parliament in a manner which had no precedent. It may be added that the agitation carried on by the Indian Association was not altogether fruitless, for some sections of the Act were modified.

The success thus achieved led the Indian Association to a still greater adventure. It had been proposed by them to send a memorial to Parliament on the Civil Service question, and a draft of the memorial was approved by the various public meetings in different provinces of India addressed by Surendra-nath. It was now decided that instead of sending the memorial by post it should be carried by a delegate in person, who would be in a position to explain the grievances of India to the British public. The expenses of this costly undertaking were met by a public-spirited lady, Mahārāṇi Swarnamoyee of Bengal, and Lal-mohan Ghosh was chosen as the delegate. Ghosh addressed a public meeting at Willis's Rooms, House of Commons, on 23 July, 1879, and his eloquent speech, followed by the sympathetic remarks of the Chairman, John Bright, created a profound impression upon the English audience. As Surendra-nath remarks: "The effect of that meeting was instantaneous. Within twenty-four hours of it, there were laid on the table of the House of Commons, the Rules creating what was subsequently known as the Statutory Civil Service".[17]

The most interesting thing about the success of Lal-mohan Ghosh was the spirit in which it was received all over India. On his return to India he was accorded a public reception at Bombay. While welcoming him, the Chairman of the meeting observed that although Lal-mohan "went from Calcutta he no less represented other parts of India as well,—that he was returning not as a delegate, simply of Calcutta, but as a delegate of Western India as well". The whole audience cheered this remark with loud applause,—a small but significant act which showed how rapidly germinated those seeds of an all-India political consciousness which Surendra-nath had sown in the course of his Indian tour.

Lal-mohan Ghosh fully justified his choice as a delegate and was highly imbued with patriotic fervour. He tersely, but correctly, expressed the ideals of the age when he said: "It is for us to transform the tiny brook of a feeble public opinion into the rushing torrent of a mighty national demonstration". Lal-mohan himself and many others, both in Bengal and in other Provinces of India, made valuable contribution to the realization of this ideal during the decade 1875-1885.

The two reactionary measures which gave incentive to the activities of the Indian Association thus proved a blessing in disguise, and helped the political progress of the country. The Indian Association also focussed India's attention upon other important questions of public character. On 27 March, 1879, it convened a public meeting at the Town Hall, Calcutta, to discuss the financial implications of the Afghan War and the reduction of import duties on cotton goods by way of favouring Manchester against the indigenous industry. The meeting was attended by three thousand people, and, to quote the annual report of the Association, was the occasion of a great demonstration of national feeling; for, from all parts of India letters and telegrams had been received from associations and representative men, expressing deep sympathy with the objects of the meeting.[18]

The Indian Association was not merely concerned with details of administration. As early as 1880 it took up the question of representative government for India. The idea was not altogether new. It was floating in the air and was occasionally given expression to by eminent Indian leaders, as mentioned above.[19] But these ideas were not taken up seriously, nor systematically pursued, by any organized political body before the Indian Association took up the question. At its annual meeting on 15 May, 1880, a committee was appointed to draft a scheme. Its importance was stressed in the Annual Report of 1880-1 as follows: "Above all there is the question of Representative Government to which the Association must soon direct its unremitting attention. It is the question of the hour and the quesion of the future".[20].

The Indian Association rightly felt that the Representative Government must be broadbased on local self-government. An agitation was therefore carried on for election, in place of nomination, of the chairman and members of the Local Boards and Municipalities. The agitation followed the usual pattern. Circulars were sent from Calcutta to different localities explaining the necessity and importance of democratic method in the administration of local affairs; public meetings were held in various localities demanding election of members and chairmen; and lastly, there was a big meeting in Calcutta to demand the democratic constitution of the local bodies, with letters and telegrams from different Provinces of India supporting the demand and giving it an all-India character. Many oppressive measures of the Government, specific grievances of the cultivators and labourers in tea-gardens, and various other subjects of public interest engaged the attention of the Indian Association and became the subjects of popular agitation guided by it.

The efforts of the Indian Association to stimulate political consciousness of the people were aided by two notable events in 1883. The first was the great controversy over a legislative measure introduced by Mr. Ilbert, the Law Member of the Viceroy's Council, and hence popularly known as the Ilbert Bill. In those days the European British subjects enjoyed the privilege of trial by a judge of their own race; hence Indian Civilians, even though they might hold the rank of Magistrates or Sessions Judges, could not try any European criminal. The Ilbert Bill sought to withdraw this privilege in order to remove a galling and glaring instance of racial inequality.[21] Reference has been made above to a similar attempt on the part of the Government in 1849, and the howling agitation of the Anglo-Indians against what they called the "Black Acts", which eventually led to the withdrawal of the measures.[22] The same type of violent agitation, but far more intense and rowdy in character, was carried on in 1883 against the Ilbert Bill by the Englishmen in India. They organized a Defence Association with branches all over the country, and collected a lakh and a half of rupees to conduct a campaign of vilification against the Indians

All notions of decency were cast aside, and the abuses and filthy language uttered by the English speakers were most shocking. One Mr. Branson, Bar-at-Law, obtained unenviable notoriety for his venomous attacks against the Indians. The Indian Association carried on a counter-agitation, and Lal-mohan Ghosh paid Branson back in his own coin. The Indian political associations of Bengal and Bombay fought hard for the Bill and a joint representation was made by them to the Viceroy. But nothing availed. The Government yielded to the violence of the Englishmen, and though the Bill was not withdrawn, it was changed beyond recognition and served no useful purpose when passed into law. One sinister aspect of the Government attitude in this matter has been emphasized by Blunt. The Government, he said, "gave way before the clamour of an insignificant section of the public, abetted by the sworn enemies of all reform in India—the Anglo-Indian bureaucracy". In support of the accusation he mentions the following: "Dr. Sandwal (Sanyal?) gave me particulars about the pressure which had been put lately on native officials about it (Ilbert Bill). A friend of his, holding a minor post under Government, had received a demi-official letter from his English superior warning him that if he attended meetings in favour of the Bill he should suffer for it."[23]

The Ilbert Bill agitation left behind it a rankling sensation of defeat, disgrace, and humiliation in the hearts of the Indians, and an increased degree of racial arrogance in the minds of the Englishmen. But every cloud has a silver lining. The Ilbert Bill greatly helped the cause of Indian political advance. The method which was so successfully pursued by the Englishmen to defeat it was not lost upon the Indians. They learnt the value of combination and organization in political struggle, and their eyes were opened to the ignoble status of the Indians in their own country. In spite of humiliation they learnt great lessons from the Anglo-Indians, and were not slow to profit by them. The Ilbert Bill agitation is thus another landmark in the history of India's political progress, and the following account given by Henry Cotton, a member of the I.C.S., may be taken as a fair and unbiassed review:

"The readers of Trevelyan's biography of Lord Macaulay will remember how the whole non-official world in India was banded together to resist what it conceived to be the monstrous injustice of Macaulay's 'Black Act', which authorised Indian Judges to exercise Civil Jurisdiction over British-born subjects. But this crisis was as nothing in comparison with that which occurred in Lord Ripon's time when Sir Ashley Eden, shortly before his retirement, proposed an amendment in the Criminal Law to give Indian Magistrates jurisdiction to try European offenders. This is the measure known as the Ilbert Bill, because it was introduced into the Legislative Council by Sir Courtenay Ilbert, who was then Legal Member. A public meeting of protest by the European community was held at the Town Hall in Calcutta; members of the Bar abandoned the noble traditions of their profession, and speakers and audience, frenzied with excitement, were lost to all sense of moderation and propriety. The Viceroy was personally insulted at the gates of Government House. A gathering of tea-planters assembled and hooted him at a railway station as he was returning from Darjilling, when 'Bill' Beresford, then an A.D.C., was with difficulty restrained from leaping from the railway carriage into their midst to avenge the insult to his chief. The non-official European community almost to a man boycotted the entertainments at Government House. Matters had reached such a pitch that a conspiracy was formed by a number of men in Calcutta, who bound themselves in the event of Government adhering to the proposed legislation, to over-power the sentries at Government House, put the Viceroy on board a steamer at Chandpal Ghat, and deport him to England round the Cape. I heard this story at the time, and it would seem to be incredible, but the facts are understood to have been within the knowledge of the Lieutenant-Governor and the Commissioner of Police.

"It is with a feeling of shame that I am bound to add that the opposition to the Ilbert Bill was headed by members of my own Service, and that the practical unanimity of opposition to that measure was as complete among civilian Magistrates and Judges as it was among planters, merchants, and members of the legal profession. Lord Ripon was thus harassed and hampered in an inconceivable degree by the bigotry and race feeling of his own fellow-countrymen. He was paralysed from want of support, and neither he nor any man in his position, single-handed, could have overcome the dead wall of antagonism by which he was confronted. The result was a sort of compromise which, according to Sir John Strachey, no mean authority, was the virtual though not avowed abandonment of the measure proposed by the Government.

"That was the immediate result. The ultimate effect of the insane agitation was to give rise to a movement of the widest reaching character and scope which few at that time were able to foresee. It is one of the ironies of history that the very object which agitations are intended to serve or to suppress should so often be lost or gained by the counter irritation which agitation sets up in a community. The great Indian movement, of which we now hear so much and are assuredly destined to hear much more, is due to causes intended to produce a very different effect. The germ of a national organization on the basis of English education had long existed, but it only sprang to life in the eighties. The Anglo-Indian agitation against Lord Ripon's government, the protests which asserted that 'the only people who have any right to India are the British', the whole attitude of Englishmen in regard to Indian interests—these things have succeeded far more in advancing the cause of Indian unity than any action or legislation on the lines contemplated by that Viceroy could have accomplished.

"The Ilbert Bill, if it had been allowed to pass without opposition, would have proved innocuous and comparatively ineffective in any direction. But the unreasonable clamour and rancour of its opponents and the unexpected success which attended their efforts suggested reprisals. Indignation found its voice; clamour was met by clamour; and a national agitation was carried on throughout the length and breadth of India. The very object was attained which, if the Anglo-Indian leaders had been wise in their generation, they would have spared no labour to prevent. The people of India were not slow to follow the example set to them by Englishmen; they learned their strength, the power of combination, the force of numbers; and there was quickly kindled in all the provinces a national movement which is destined to develop and increase until it receives its fulfilment in the systematic regeneration of the whole country."[24]

Along with the above may be read with interest the following views expressed by A. C. Mazumdar, an eminent political leader:

"The Ilbert Bill agitation thus went a great way towards impressing the Indian races, that in the political world success did not depend so much upon men as on organized efforts and so paved the way to united and concerted action. It also proved an eye-opener to those talented and highly educated Indian gentlemen who, having returned from England and adopted English habits and manners, had lost nearly all touch with their countrymen and were apparently seeking to form a class by themselves in the vain hope of assimilating themselves, as far as practicable, with the Anglo-Indian community. Forces were thus at work driving the people from different points of the compass to a common fold and to concentrate their thoughts, ideas and activities to a common focus for the attainment of the political rights and privileges of the people who being under a common rule, it was understood, could have but a common goal and common destiny. All the time the Indian Press throughout the country was incessantly urging the people to unite under a common standard".[25]

Mr. Mazumdar notes, however, that "the agitation stirred up the public mind only in Bengal and Bombay. It produced little or no effect in Madras, while the N. W. Provinces and the Punjab were perfectly silent."[26] This is not an unfair index of the progress of political thought and organization in different parts of India.

The excitement caused by the agitation over the Ilbert Bill had hardly died down when a charge was brought against Surendra-nath Banerji for contempt of court on account of some comments he had made on the conduct of Mr. Justice Norris of the Calcutta High Court who ordered a Hindu to produce the image of his deity in the Court. Although Surendra-nath tendered apology, the majority of the Judges found him guilty, and sentenced him to imprisonment, but the only Indian Judge dissented from this view. The case had created great sensation from the very beginning, because Justice Norris had taken a prominent part in the Ilbert Bill agitation. A vast crowd attended the Court during the trial, and when the sentence of two months' imprisonment was pronounced, a section of the crowd, mostly composed of students, became excited and smashed the windows of the building. Indeed so menacing was the attitude of the crowd, who had begun to pelt stones at the police, that Surendra-nath had to be removed secretly by a back-door in a private carriage instead of the prison van.[27]

The incarceration of Surendra-nath, like the deplorable Anglo-Indian agitation over the Ilbert Bill, was not an unmixed evil, and furthered the cause of India's political advance. It evoked a spontaneous protest from all sections of people in Bengal which was unprecedented in character. All business was suspended, shops were closed, and a strong wave of indignation swept the whole of Bengal and even regions far outside its boundary. Numerous protest meetings were held in different towns in Bengal, and sometimes the attendance was so large that they had to be held in the open air. The meeting organized by the Indian Association was held in the Beadon Square on 16 May, 1883. "It was the largest meeting ever held in Calcutta. There were about twenty thousand people present representing different sections of the community; numerous telegrams and letters as well as the presence of delegates specially sent from the Muffassil on the occasion testified to the all-pervading sympathy and interest of the country". Not only the educated classes but even the masses were affected. No such upheaval was witnessed in Bengal before the days of *Swadeshi* agitation in 1905.[28]

Far more significant was the fact that the imprisonment of Surendra-nath evoked sympathy and protest in remote parts of India, and public meetings were held in Agra, Fyzabad, Amritsar, Lahore, Poona and various other towns all over India. Even a Pandit of Kashmir, ignorant of English, burst into tears, crying, "What have they done with our dearest brother? Our Surendranath is in jail."[29] All these testify to the extent to which the bonds of fellowship and good feeling between the different parts of India had been forged during the eighties of the nineteenth century. The following observations by Ananda-mohan Basu in the Annual Report of the Indian Association for 1883 are highly significant:

"That 'good cometh out of evil' was never more fully illustrated than in this notable event. It has now been demonstrated, by the universal outburst of grief and indignation which the event called forth, that the people of the different Indian provinces have learnt to feel for one another; and that a common bond of unity and fellow-feeling is rapidly being established among them. And Babu Surendranath Banerjea has at least one consolation, that his misfortune awakened, in a most marked form, a manifestation of that sense of unity among the different Indian races, for the accomplishment of which he has so earnestly striven and not in vain."[30]

The incarceration of Surendra-nath produced another good result. Babu Tara-pada Banerji of Krishnagar (Nadia Dt., Bengal) started the idea of a National Fund as a memento of the imprisonment of Surendra-nath.[30a] He was released from jail on 4 July, 1883. On 17 July, a public meeting was held which was attended by over ten thousand people. It was resolved to raise a National Fund to secure the political advancement of the country by means of constitutional agitation in India and England. A sum of about Rs. 20,000 was collected and it was made over to the Indian Association, Calcutta, for the promotion of political work.[31]

The agitation over the Ilbert Bill and the imprisonment of Surendra-nath had one particular feature of great importance. This was the part played by the student community in matters of public importance which agitated the country. They took a prominent part in the organization of public meetings, and openly gave vent to their feelings of resentment against the Government. Many students became victims of official repression, and many cases of harsh treatment, sometimes unduly severe, were reported in the newspapers of the time. The Government showed as much nervousness about the student agitators in 1883 as they did in the twentieth century.

The memorable events of 1883 brought into the forefront the question of a political organization of all-India character.[32] In spite of its remarkable achievements, the Indian Association was, after all, a provincial organization, and many felt the need of a closely knit organization embracing the whole of India. The feelings evoked by the Ilbert Bill agitation and the imprisonment of Surendranath seemed to be very favourable for such an attempt, and fortunately the necessary opportunity was provided by the proposal of the Government to hold an International Exhibition in Calcutta in 1883. The Indian Association naturally expected that a large number of eminent Indians would visit Calcutta on the occasion, and resolved to take advantage of it to inaugurate an all-India National Conference at that time. The idea was fully approved by all the branches of the Association in North India as well as by the leading political organizations of Bombay and Madras. Backed by this support of the country as a whole the Indian Association called the First National Conference in Calcutta to be held on 28, 29 and 30. December, 1883.

This National Conference is an important landmark in the history of the evolution of political organization, as it was the first all-India political conference which offered a model to the Indian National Congress, inaugurated two years later. Unfortunately, it was cast into shade by the growth and phenomenal progress of the latter organization, and has not been accorded the place it deserves in Indian history. As such, it requires a more detailed treatment than its brief tenure of existence would warrant.

The genesis of the Conference is thus described by Surendranath. "The idea of a National Conference is as old as the year 1877. It originated on the occasion of the Delhi assemblage, when the princes and the rulers of the land met for the purpose of a great show, and it suggested itself to the minds of many that the representatives of the people might also meet, if not for the purpose of a show, at least for the consideration and discussion of questions of national importance. That idea, however, was not realised until 1883".[33]

"The objects of the National Conference were not sectional nor regional but truly national". "We have met", continued Surendranath, "to talk, to deliberate, to consult, and if possible, to arrive at a common programme of political action. Too often our energies are frittered away in isolated and individual efforts. One Association, for instance, might be agitating for the Reform of the Civil Service, a second for the Reconstitution of the Legislative Councils, a third for Retrenchment of Expenditure. Our idea is to bring the national forces, so to speak, into a focus; and if possible to concentrate them upon some common object calculated to advance the public good. Such I conceive to be the prevailing idea of the Conference".[34]

The Conference, which met in the Albert Hall on 28 December, 1883, was attended by more than a hundred delegates, both Hindu and Muslim, and the places they represented, outside Bengal, included Bombay, Madras, Lahore, Allahabad, Delhi, Cuttack, Jubbulpore, Nagpur, Ahmedabad, Bankipore, Muzaffarpur, Darbhanga, Deoghar, Saugor, Bhagalpur, Meerut, Tejpur, Hossainpore etc.

The proceedings began with a national hymn. The questions that were taken up for discussion included industrial and technical education, the wider employment of Indians in Civil Service, separation of the judicial from the executive functions, Representative Government, National Fund and Arms Act.

The Conference was attended by two Englishmen, one of whom, W. S. Blunt, has recorded his impressions in the following words:

> "Then at twelve, I went to the first meeting of the National Conference, a really important occasion, as there were delegates from most of the great towns, and, as Bose (Ananda Mohan) in his opening speech remarked, it was the first stage towards a National Parliament."[35]

The second session of the National Conference was held in Calcutta in 1885 on December 25, 26 and 27. It was more representative than the first, being joined by the British Indian Association, representing the landed aristocracy, which had kept aloof from the first session. As a matter of fact, the Conference was convened by the three leading Associations of Calcutta, viz., the British Indian, the Indian, and the Central Muhammadan Association. More than thirty political Associations, mostly of Northern India, sent their representatives to the Conference. "Mr. Cotton took part in the proceedings of the conference and assured the delegates that many of his countrymen in England sympathised with the natives of this country and their desire for more enlarged representation in the Legislative Assemblies of the Empire, but counselled moderation".[35a]

Surendra-nath moved the first resolution on the reconstitution of the Legislative Councils in such a way that popular opinion might be reflected in it. Among other subjects which were discussed may be mentioned the Arms Act, the Civil Service question, the separation of the judicial and executive functions, and the retrenchment of expenditure, mainly under three heads, viz., annual military expenditure, the 'home charges', and the enormous cost of civil administration. In short, almost all the questions that formed the chief planks in the Congress platform during the first twenty years of its existence were discussed in the two sessions of the National Conference.

The Indian Association wanted to give a permanent character to the Conference. Accordingly, Surendra-nath moved 'that a Conference of delegates from different parts of the country should be held next year.' The delegates from Allahabad and Meerut lent their support to the resolution. The latter suggested that the venue of the Conference should be changed every year and it should meet in places like Bombay, Madras, Allahabad and other great capitals of India. This resolution was carried with acclamation.

At the conclusion of the proceedings of the National Conference, a telegram to the following effect was sent to the political conference about to be held at Bombay: "The delegates in conference assembled in Calcutta desire to express their deep sympathy with the approaching Conference in Bombay."[36]

This Conference was the Indian National Congress, which held its first session at Bombay on 28 December, 1885. A deep mystery hangs round the almost simultaneous holding of these two all-India national organizations. The following extract from Surendra-nath's autobiography throws some light on the subject.

"While we were having our National Conference in Calcutta, the Indian National Congress, conceived on the same lines and having the same programme, was holding its first sittings at Bombay. The movements were simultaneous; the preliminary arrangements were made independently, neither party knowing what the other was doing until on the eve of the sittings of the Conference and of the Congress. Mr. W. C. Bonnerjee, who presided over the Bombay Congress, invited me to attend it. I told him that it was too late to suspend the Conference, and that as I had a large share in its organization it would not be possible for me to leave Calcutta and attend the Bombay Congress."[37]

It must be regarded as passing strange that even a person like Surendra-nath should not have been one of the sponsors of the new political organization. But that he should not have even been invited to attend it, till at the very last moment, seems to be so extraordinary that one cannot help feeling that there was some underlying motive in thus deliberately excluding him.

Perhaps no less mysterious is the silent self-effacement of the National Conference in favour of the Indian National Congress. On this important point Surendra-nath simply observes as follows:

"The two Conferences met about the same time, discussed similar views and voiced the same grievances and aspirations. The one that met in Calcutta was called the 'National Conference' and the other, which assembled at Bombay, the 'Indian National Congress.'

Henceforth those who worked with us joined the Congress and heartily co-operated with it."[38]

This passage contains all the reliable information that is available on the subject, but does not help in any way to solve the mystery referred to above. It merely states the fact, but does not give any satisfactory explanation. Nor does it throw any light on the stages or process of the amalgamation of the two organizations.[38a]

The end of the National Conference was sudden and abrupt, but by no means inglorious. This Conference was the crowning achievement of the Indian Association and marks the culmination of the political evolution in Bengal for more than half a century. It gave the first impetus and supplied the pattern for that dynamic all-India national movement which took a permanent form in the Indian National Congress.

II. BOMBAY AND MADRAS

Next to Bengal, the evolution of political ideas and organizations was more marked in Bombay than in any other part of India. This was due in no small measure to the able leadership of the so-called triumvirate, namely, Kashinath Trimbak Telang, Pherozeshah Mehta and Badruddin Tyabjee. Another eminent leader was Mahadev Govind Ranade, but he was associated with social and economic, rather than political, problems.

The general trend of political ideas in Bombay during the seventies may be gathered from the speeches and activities of Pherozeshah Mehta. Like Dadabhai Naoroji, Mehta had a sincere faith in the sense of justice and fair play of the British and completely relied on them for the political salvation of India. "When in the inscrutable dispensations of Providence", said he, "India was assigned to the care of England, she decided that India was to be governed on the principles of justice, equality and righteousness without distinctions of colour, caste or creed".[39]

Even the European agitation over the Ilbert Bill and its withdrawal by the Government of India did not modify the views of Mehta. On the other hand, he was a severe critic of the autocratic measures of Lord Lytton who, in his opinion, substituted a "narrow-minded policy of autocratic imperialism" in place of the traditional British policy of "initiating oriental nations into systematic political life and existence". He even went to the extent of opposing the proposal of giving a public address and erecting a memorial to Sir Richard Temple, the retiring Governor of Bombay.[40] When, on account of the menace of Russian invasion, the Government decided to form a Volunteer Corps exclusively from the European population, Mehta entered a strong and emphatic protest.[41] He had faith in the capacity of the Indians to manage representative institutions, and also believed that "the time was past when strong popular opinion on any subject could be successfully resisted by Government for any length of time."

As already noted above, next to Bengal Bombay was seriously perturbed by the Ilbert Bill agitation. It was mainly as a result of this that the Bombay Presidency Association came into being. The oldest political association in Bombay, the Bombay Association, founded in 1852,[42] had lost its vitality within a decade and, though "revived in 1870 and galvanised into fresh life by Mr. Naoroji Furdunji in 1873, it shortly became practically extinct."[43] This was partly due to the fact that a Branch of the East India Association of London was established in Bombay in 1871 and carried on useful work in developing political ideas. But its useful career came to an end along with that of the parent body in London, to which reference will be made later.[43a]

After making vain efforts to put fresh life into these two political organizations, Mehta, Tyabji and Telang conceived the idea of starting a new political association in Bombay. For this purpose they convened a public meeting on 31 January, 1885, which was attended by a large number of persons representing all classes and shades of opinion. The Bombay Presidency Association, which was inaugurated in this meeting, amid great public enthusiasm, "showed considerable activity in the early years of its existence. By resolutions, memorials, and public meetings it focussed the general feeling of the community on all matters of common interest". Unfortunately, the public interest gradually waned and the whole show was run by the illustrious triumvirate.[44] While there is a great deal of truth in these remarks, it is only fair to remember that after the foundation of the Indian National Congress in December, 1885, the main political activities of India flowed through that great channel, leaving the other fields high and dry.

A passing reference should be made to a new venture undertaken by the Bombay Presidency Association. They took advantage of the forthcoming General Election in England to make some propaganda in that country on behalf of India. Having received good response to their appeal for co-operation from the other two Presidencies, and acting jointly with the Poona Sārvajanik Sabhā, three delegates representing the three Presidencies were sent to England. They were to support those English candidates for Parliament who had made the cause of India their own, by speeches and distributing leaflets which were calculated to make the British people acquainted with the true condition of India and the hopes and aspirations of her people. How far the delegates succeeded in educating the British electorate, it is difficult to say, but to judge by the result, it must have been very little indeed. In any case, the candidates supported by them were not returned to the Parliament, while those who were condemned as anti-Indian were mostly successful in the election. It is necessary to remember, however, that the electors were influenced more by the vital issues of the party politics at home than by any Indian policy.[45]

Reference has been made above to the Poona Sārvajanik Sabhā. It was established in 1867 and issued a Quarterly Journal since 1878. Its object, to use its own words, was 'to represent the wants and wishes of the inhabitants of the Deccan, being appointed on a popular elective system'. The members of the Sabhā consisted of the "Sardars, Jahagirdars, Inamdars, Sawakars and the Gentry, who... represent the people of Maharashtra." In reply to an Address, in 1884, to the Raja of Kolhapur, from which the above is quoted, the Dewan said that the Sabhā "has become...the recognized political organ of the people of Maharashtra", noted for "assiduous and prompt application to the various important public questions." This is fully borne out by the contents of the Journal. The Dewan also referred to the "useful services rendered by the Sabha to our country, by its indefatigable exertions in representing to the paramount British power, in a spirit of sober independence and profound loyalty, the wants and aspirations of the people."[46] This is hardly an exaggerated account. A more detailed account of the Sārvajanik Sabhā is given in the Appendix.

Another important political association of the time was the 'Mahājan Sabhā' of Madras, founded on 16 May, 1884. A fair idea of its views and activities may be formed from the proceedings of the Conference which was summoned by it and met for four days, 29 and 30 December, 1884, and 1 and 2 January, 1885. A paper was read recommending the expansion of the Legislative Council to the furthest limit allowed by the Act of 1861, the non-official members being appointed on a representative basis. It was decided to send a memorial on this line to the Government. Another topic discussed was the separation of the judicial from revenue functions.

In addition to the political associations mentioned above, there were many other political organizations in different parts of India, which may be regarded as feeder institutions and were mostly of local importance.

III. POLITICAL PROPAGANDA IN ENGLAND

The agitation for the introduction of reforms in Indian administration was not confined to India or to the Indians. From very early times the work in India was supplemented by work in England, both by the Indians and Englishmen. The first Indian to realise the importance of such work was Raja Rammohan Roy. The memorandum which he submitted to the Parliamentary Committee on Indian affairs was the first authentic statement of Indian views placed before the British authorities by an eminent Indian. It is generally agreed that this and other activities of the Raja during his visit to England (1830-33) produced some good effect and influenced the Charter Act of 1833.[47]

Dwaraka-nath Tagore, the grandfather of poet Rabindra-nath, was the next prominent Indian political leader to visit England. The honour and cordiality with which he was received in Britain offers a striking and refreshing contrast to the general attitude of the British towards the Indians in later times. During his first visit to Britain in 1842, he was given a public reception by the notabilities of England, and even Her Majesty Queen Victoria invited him to lunch and dinner. Special importance attaches to a function at Edinburgh where a public address was given to Dwaraka-nath Tagore in which a hope was expressed that in India "the rod of oppression may be for ever broken and that the yoke of an unwilling subjection may be everywhere exchanged for a voluntary allegiance."[48]

Both Rammohan, and Dwaraka-nath felt the need of carrying on propaganda in England on behalf of India, and made permanent arrangements for this work, as mentioned above.[49] This was further facilitated by the fact that throughout the nineteenth century a band of noble-minded Englishmen, inspired by the liberal and democratic views of their country, felt real sympathy for India and exerted themselves on her behalf. Of the many Englishmen of this type special reference should be made to Fawcett, John Bright, Charles Bradlaugh, and Digby who were public men in England, and Allan Octavian Hume, William Wedderburn, and Henry Cotton, who were members of the Indian Civil Service.

Henry Fawcett has justly been described as "one of the greatest and truest friends of India in England". He entered the House of Commons in 1865. His close vigilance and unremitting attention to the Indian finance earned for him the sobriquet of "Member for India" He openly and repeatedly advocated the appointment of able Indians in increasing number to the higher branches of administration in their own country, and, in 1868, moved a resolution in the House of Commons for holding the competitive examination for admission to the Indian Civil Service, not only in London, but also simultaneously in Calcutta, Bombay and Madras.

Fawcett deplored the lack of interest in Indian affairs even among the members of the House of Commons. Addressing his constituency at Brighton in 1872, he said: "The most trumpery question ever brought before Parliament, a wrangle over the purchase of a picture, excited more interest than the welfare of one hundred and eighty millions of our Indian fellow-subjects. The people of India have no votes, they cannot bring even so much pressure to bear upon Parliament as can be brought by one of our Railway Companies; but with some confidence I believe that I shall not be misinterpreting your wishes if, as your representative, I do whatever can be done by one humble individual to render justice to the defenceless and powerless."[50]

Nearly three-fourths of the army that took part in the Abyssinian expedition of 1868 were drawn from India and the entire cost was thrown upon the Indian exchequer. Fawcett protested against this in the House of Commons, but found himself in the minority of 23 to 198, though later, on account of his repeated protests, the cost was shared between England and India.[51] Fawcett also protested against the cost of the Ball Dance given to the Sultān of Turkey at the India Office being charged to India.

Fawcett was never tired of drawing attention to the dire poverty of India and the dangerously narrow margin upon which the mass of the Indian population lived on the verge of starvation. It was at his instance that in 1871 the British Parliament appointed a committee, with Fawcett himself as Chairman, to inquire into the financial administration of India. Fawcett was also unsparing in his criticism of the autocratic régime of Lord Lytton. He attacked the policy leading to war with Afghanistan, and vigorously denounced the remission of cotton import duties for the sake of party interest in England, as well as the extravagant expenditure incurred for the Delhi Durbar, particularly at a time when India was in the grip of a terrible famine.

India fully appreciated the services of Fawcett who had been fighting, almost single-handed, her cause against tremendous odds against his own countrymen. He was so loved and admired by the Indians that when, at the General Election of 1874, he lost his seat for Brighton, a sum of £ 750 was raised by public subscription in India to enable him to contest another seat. The pious wishes of India were fulfilled, for Fawcett was shortly after returned to the House of Commons from Hackney.

There is no evidence to show that the sympathy and activities of Fawcett and other British friends of India, to whom reference has been made elsewhere, really exercised any appreciable influence on British policy towards India. But it had a great effect upon Indian politics. Throughout the nineteenth and part of the twentieth century their examples kept up the faith of the largest and most influential section of Indian political leaders in the sense of justice and fair play of the British, and sustained their hope that the Indians would attain their political goal with the help and co-operation of the British.

One of the oldest and most well-known representatives of this class of Indian politicians was Dadabhai Naoroji to whom reference has already been made above. He was also one of the small band of Indians who made England their centre of activity for the political advancement of India by awakening the consciousness of the British people to their sense of duty towards India, and appealing to their democratic instincts and liberal principles. In order to carry on this work in a regular and systematic manner Dadabhai, in collaboration with W.C. Bonnerjee, started a society in London, in order to enable the Indians and Englishmen to meet together and discuss various matters concerning Indian administration. It was called 'The London Indian Society' and its inaugural meeting was held at the London residence of Jñānendra-mohan Tagore in 1865. Dadabhai was the President of the Society and Bonnerjee, the Secretary.[52] This Society was amalgamated within a year with another Society known as the 'East India Association', which was inaugurated on 1 December, 1866, in collaboration with a Committee of retired English officials. This Society became very popular and counted among its members, patrons and sympathisers a large number of Englishmen who had distinguished themselves in various walks of life, as well as retired high officials from India, resident in England, who felt sympathy for Indian aspirations. Its meetings were usually well attended, and various grievances of India were discussed and remedial measures of various kinds proposed therein. It soon became recognized as an important political association and branches of it were established in Bombay, Calcutta, and Madras in 1869. By the year 1871 the number of members of the East India Association ran into four figures and it began to exercise some influence even in the British Parliament. It continued its useful career till 1884 and then gradually sank in importance, due mainly, no doubt, to a change in the attitude of the Englishmen towards India. The shadow of Jingo Imperialism was slowly creeping over Indo-British relations. The East India Association continued—it continues even today—but it lacked the old sympathy for India and consequently lost its old vigorous activity, beneficial to India.[53]

Another association, with a view to carrying on both social and political work for India in London, was founded in 1867 by Mary Carpenter, the famous biographer of Raja Rammohan Roy, who visited India four times during the sixties and seventies of the nineteenth century. The "National Indian Association", as it was called, had its branches in different parts of India. It did not, however, acquire much importance.[54]

Reference may be made to a few Indians who distinguished themselves by propagating Indian views during short residence in England. Ananda-mohan Bose, a young student of Cambridge, established 'Indian Society' in London in 1872 in order to foster the spirit of nationalism among the Indian residents in Britian. About his speech at Brighton in 1873 Mr. White, M.P., remarked that never in his life had he listened to a more eloquent description of the wrongs of India. Bose's speech was mainly instrumental in carrying by 74 votes against 26 a motion in the Cambridge University Union, "that in the opinion of this House England has failed in her duties to India", moved by Syed Mahmud.[55]

APPENDIX

SĀRVAJANIK SABHĀ—POONA

Started originally as Poona Association in 1867 (on the lines of Bombay Association started in 1852 in Bombay), the Sārvajanik Sabhā got its name three years later, and its main object was to serve as a bridge between the Government on the one hand and the people on the other. Just as it was necessary for the Government to know the reactions of the public for whom it was in fact administering, so also the public in their turn had to be told what Government was aiming at in enacting certain legislations.

Curiously enough, almost the first public work that the Sabhā had to do, was to bring about suitable changes in the management of the famous Pārvatī Temple of Poona. Originally it was patronised by most of the Southern Maratha "Princes" who had their "palaces" (=*Wadas*) in Poona. They even held leading offices of the Sabhā as chairman, vice-chairman and secretary. This princely aspect of the Sabhā did not endure long; by 1897, the Government of Bombay withdrew the recognition they had previously granted to the Sabhā as a public body, and one by one, all the princely figures as well as Government officials cut off their connection with it.

It is not clear whether M. G. Ranade had any official connection with the Sabhā, as his name is not found among the members, founders, or patrons. But this much is clear that he was the strong man behind the screen, pulling wires in this or that direction for making people institution-minded, giving them, as it were, practical lessons in running bodies engaged in public service. His close association with G.K.Gokhale, who was the Sabhā's Secretary (1891-96), and with many others, indicates that though Ranade's connections with the Sabhā were not direct, the indirect influence which he wielded was very strong. This was evident when, after the 'extremists' under B. G. Tilak had captured the committee of management, the defeated group, again under the guiding influence of Ranade, started what came to be known as the Deccan Sabhā in 1896.

It will be difficult to adequately appreciate the achievements of the Sārvajanik Sabhā at this distance of time. In the early stages of awakening the people, rousing them to the political consciousness of their rights, and inculcating in their minds the necessity of fighting constitutionally for them, the Sabhā's work must be considered highly important as the Government of the day was prompted to withdraw recognition from it. Similar fate was not the lot of other contemporary organizations, working in Bombay or Calcutta. Its greatest contribution was the awakening of the people and the direct help it rendered during the great famine of 1876-77. It can be said that the Sabhā was mainly responsible for the relief operations started by the Government and concessions that were secured for the peasants and victims of the catastrophe.

Expression of representative views on important public topics was regularly undertaken by the Sabhā through memorials submitted to Government and through its quarterly journal that was well-informed and conducted in a dignified manner. Authoritative studies on agricultural and financial problems of the day always appeared in the pages of this quarterly journal, and although Government had withdrawn its recognition of the Sabhā, it could not ignore its activities. The expositions in its journal were appreciated even in high official circles, being the contributions of the best brains outside the official world.

Able political leaders like Ranade, Gokhale and Tilak had made the Sārvajanik Sabhā what it was, and it undoubtedly was the training school for many politicians and agitators of the day. But by the time Tilak returned from Mandalay in 1914, it was evident that the Sabhā had outlived its utility. It exists today, more as a relic of the past than as a living institution.[56]

---

1. *A Nation in Making*, 67.
2. *Bengal Celebrities*, 41.
3. Quoted in the *Free Lance*, Puja Number, 1957; H.P. Ghosh, p. 33.
4. Bagal-V, p. 8.

5. Ibid, 10.
6. *A Nation in Making*, 41
7. Ibid, 42.
8. Bagal-V, p. 15.
9. *A Nation in Making*, 42.
10. Ibid, 44.
11. Ibid.
12. Ibid, 44-51.
13. Cotton-I, p. 28.
14. See p. 247.
15. See pp. 244-5.
16. Bagal-V, pp. 34-9.
17. *A Nation in Making*, 54; cf. Vol. IX, pp. 787-9.
18. Bagal-V, p. 41; cf. Vol. IX, pp. 801 ff., 161 ff.
19. See p. 499.
20. Bagal-V, p. 48.
21. cf. Vol. IX, p. 346.
22. Ibid.
23. W.S. Blunt-I, pp. 100, 273.
24. Cotton-II, pp. 178-81.
25. *Indian National Evolution*, 39.
26. Ibid, 38.
27. *A Nation in Making*, 76; Bagal-V, p. 60.
28. *A Nation in Making*, 79.
29. Ibid, 80.
30. Ibid, 80-1.

30a. Ibid, 81. J.C. Bagal, however, points out that the idea was first mooted by the *Brahmo Public Opinion*, which, in its issue of 21st June, 1883, proposed editorially that such a fund for national purposes should be opened. On the lines of this proposal Tarapada Banerji, the leader of Krishnagar, formulated a scheme on the subject and got it published on 4 July, 1883, in the *Indian Mirror* (Bagal-V, p. 61).

31. *A Nation in Making*, 85; Bagal-V, pp. 61-3.
32. It is urged by some that it was Tarapada Banerji, mentioned above in f.n., 30a, who suggested the creation of a national assembly and a national fund in a letter published in the *Indian Mirror* of June 4, 1883 (*Congress in Evolution* by D. Chakrabarty and C. Bhattacharyya, p. xvii). cf. fn. 30a.
33. Bagal-V, pp. 80-1.
34. Ibid, 81.
35. Blunt-I, pp. 114, 116.

35a. The details are given in the *Hindoo Patriot*, December 28, 1885, from which this extract is quoted.

36. Bagal-V, pp. 80-8.
37. *A Nation in Making*, 98.
38. Ibid, 99.

38a. These questions have been fully discussed in the *Glimpses of Bengal in the Nineteenth Century*, by R. C. Majumdar, pp. 97-100.

39. Mody, *Ferozeshah Mehta*, I, 130-1.
40. Ibid, 108-9.
41. Ibid, 92.
42. See p. 459.
43. A. C. Mazumdar, p. 6.

43a. See pp. 520-1.

44. Mody, 166-8.
45. Ibid, 169 ff.
46. *Journal of the Poona Sarvajanik Sabha*, 1885.
47. See p. 438.
48. Mitra, K.C., *Memoirs of Dwarkanath Tagore*, pp. 88 ff.
49. See p. 447.
50. A. C. Mazumdar, pp. 13-4.
51. W. Hunt and R. L. Poole (Ed.), *Political History of England*, Vol. XII, pp. 309-10.
52. *Bengal Celebrities*, p. 41.
53. Masani, *Dadabhai*, p. 224.
54. *Modern Review*, December, 1948, p. 463.
55. H.C. Sarkar, *Anandmohan Bose*, p. 35.
56. I am indebted for this note to Shri S. R. Tikekar of Bombay (Ed.).

CHAPTER XV (LIII.)

THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS

I. THE GENESIS

A new era in the political life of India began with the foundation of the Indian National Congress towards the very end of the year 1885. For more than twenty years after that it completely dominated the political life of India and gave a shape and form to the ideas of administrative and constitutional reforms which formed the chief planks in the political programme of India. Even though the Congress ceased to play the dominant role in Indian politics after the split at Surat in 1907, it served the very useful purpose of keeping alive an all-India political platform which enabled Gandhi to revitalise this great organization and make it a fit instrument for leading India, stage by stage, to its goal of independence.

It is difficult to think of any age or country in which a single political institution played such a dominant rôle for more than fifty years in the liberation of a country from foreign yoke. It is not, however, historically accurate to say, as many do, that the history of the Freedom Movement in India is nothing but the history of the Indian National Congress; for, as will be shown later, there were other forces and agencies at work to achieve the same end. Nevertheless, the Congress must always form the central theme in any delineation of India's long struggle for freedom—the pivot round which revolves or evolves that story of epic grandeur.

The Indian National Congress was the result, rather the culmination, of the evolution of those political ideas and organisations which have been described in detail in the three preceding chapters. There as nothing like the sudden emergence of a political institution, nor was there anything novel either in its ideas or methods, for the National Conference held in Calcutta in 1883 and 1885 forestalled it in all essential aspects.

There is a general consensus of opinion that the reactionary measures of Lord Lytton and the Anglo-Indian agitation over the Ilbert Bill hastened the process which ultimately led to the foundation of the Congress. There is equally little doubt that the Congress was the direct result and a visible embodiment of the national awakening which has been described in Chapter XIII, and owed not a little to the English education and all the liberal political ideas of the West which came along with it. It will also be perhaps generally agreed that the inauguration of the Indian National Congress was facilitated, and to a large extent inspired, by the various political associations that existed in different parts of the country, and the all-India tours of Surendra-nath Banerji, to both of which reference has been made above.

It is not, however, an easy task to trace the genesis of the Indian National Congress as a distinct institution. The problem has been stated as follows by Pattabhi Sitaramayya in his *History of the Indian National Congress*, published by the Working Committee of the Congress:

"It is shrouded in mystery as to who originated this idea of an All-India Congress. Apart from the great Darbar of 1877 or the International Exhibition in Calcutta, which, as stated above, are supposed to have furnished the model for the great national assemblage, it is also said that the idea was conceived in a private meeting of seventeen men after the Theosophical Convention held at Madras in December, 1884.[2] The Indian Union started by Mr. Hume after his retirement from the Civil Service is also supposed to have been instrumental in convening the Congress. Whatever the origin, and whoever the originator of the idea, we come to this conclusion, that the idea was in the air, that the need of such an organisation was being felt, that Mr. Allan Octavian Hume took the initiative, and that it was in March 1885, when the first notice was issued convening the first Indian National Union to meet at Poona in the following December, that what had been a vague idea floating generally in the air and influencing simultaneously the thought of thoughtful Indians in the north and the south, the east and the west, assumed a definite shape and became a practical programme of action."[1]

As pointed out above, the Delhi Durbar of 1877 suggested to Surendra-nath Banerji the idea, not of the Indian National Congress, but of the National Conference which was held in Calcutta on 28 December, 1883.[2] He chose this date in order to take advantage of the presence of the people from different parts of India on the occasion of the Exhibition, to be held in Calcutta about that time. The third source of Sitaramayya is also more than doubtful. The theory that seventeen Indians, most of whom attended the Theosophical Convention at Madras, conceived the idea of the Congress, is found in Mrs. Besant's book *How India wrought for Freedom*.[3] Besides her statement there is no evidence to connect the meeting of these seventeen men with the organization of the Congress. But there are glaring inaccuracies in the statement. Mrs. Besant includes Surendra-nath Banerji among these seventeen.[4] But Surendra-nath himself says that "while we were organizing our National Conference at Calcutta, some of our friends headed by the late Mr. Allan Hume had met at Madras for a similar purpose."[5] There seems to be a double contradiction between the statements of Surendra-nath and Mrs. Besant. In the first place, Surendra-nath was evidently not present in the meeting at Madras though Mrs. Besant includes his name. This is not only implied in the statement of Surendra-nath just quoted, but also follows from another statement of his, almost immediately preceding it, viz., that he did not know anything about the Conference (later called Indian National Congress) "until on the eve of the sittings of the Conference (National Conference held in Calcutta) and of the Congress". Secondly, Hume, whom Surendra-nath places at the head of the list of those who attended the meeting, and who is universally regarded as the founder of the Congress, was not one of the seventeen "good men and true" named by Mrs. Besant. In view of this flat contradiction on a vital point, it is difficult to place much reliance on the somewhat vague statement, unsupported by any positive evidence, that the idea of the Indian National Congress was conceived by seventeen men, nearly all of whom were delegates to the annual Convention of the Thesophical Society held in December, 1884, at Adyar, Madras. It is, however, probable that a small body, including some delegates, met together and discussed the idea of a political organization.[5a] But it is difficult to believe, as stated by Mrs. Besant, that this body set up a number of "provisional Committes" who would work in different parts of India and meet later for consultation. Mrs. Besant herself admits that "there seems to be no record of the work done in their own towns and provinces on their return home."[5b] Yet she seems to convey, at least indirectly, that it was through their initiative that a circular was issued in March, summoning the Congress,[5c] as will be related later. But Wedderburn, the biographer of Hume, who gives a detailed account of the preliminary steps taken by Hume in connection with the first session of the Congress, makes no reference to the meeting at Madras or the committees set up by it. It is also worthy of note that the majority of the seventeen persons who, according to Mrs. Besant, took the initiative, did not attend the first session of the Congress. In view of all this, we cannot accept the view of Mrs. Besant.

Thus of the three possible sources, referred to by Sitaramayya, the first two are definitely wrong and the third has nothing to commend itself. In view of this it is not a little curious that Sitaramayya did not refer to the National Conference in Calcutta as even a possible source of the idea of the Congress. He certainly knew of this Conference and refers to it only a few lines above his discussion of the possible sources of the Congress, quoted above. Yet the idea does not seem to have occurred to him that this Conference could most reasonably be looked upon as furnishing the idea of an All-India political organization such as the Congress was intended to be. This is quite clear from his conclusion, namely, "that the idea was in the air, that the need of such an organisation was being felt, that Hume took the initiative." It is difficult to accept this conclusion. The idea was not merely in the air, as he says, but took a definite shape in the National Conference of Calcutta. As Surendra-nath rightly points out, 'the Indian National Congress was conceived on the same lines and had the same programme as the National Conference'.[6] Another President of the Indian National Congress more definitely states that the Calcutta National Conference "anticipated the Congress by two years and in a large measure prepared the ground for the great National Assembly".[7] The authors of the *Rise and Growth of the Congress* observe with reference to the Indian Association of Calcutta which sponsored the National Conference: "It has to be remembered that the idea of holding an All-India Conference with representatives from every province was its own invention."[8] It is relevant to note in this connection that the organizers of the Indian National Congress knew about the National Conference of Calcutta, for Surendra-nath tells us that 'K. T. Telang wrote to him from Bombay requesting him to send him some notes about the First National Conference held in 1883'. The old Dadabhai Naoroji was also credited with the foundation of the Indian National Congress, and the question was referred to the old Dinshaw Wacha. He repudiated the idea and said: "The idea of the Indian National Congress originated with Hume, and not with Dadabhai Naoroji. The idea of a National Assembly with a National Fund came from the public men of Calcutta."[9] Taking all these things into consideration it is a reasonable assumption that the idea and model of the Indian National Congress, as a specific institution of All-India politics, are to be traced to the Calcutta National Conference.

But whatever may be the genesis, the credit of organizing the Indian National Congress undoubtedly belongs to a large extent to Allan Octavian Hume, a retired member of the Indian Civil Service, and son of the founder of the Radical Party in England. There is no doubt that he was inspired by genuine feeling of sympathy for the interest and welfare of India, and it by no means detracts from the merit of this noble-minded Englishman that in setting up a political organization like the Congress, he could not possibly be, and was crtainly not, inspired by the same national sentiment and patriotic yearning for freedom of India which characterized the advanced political thinkers of Bengal and other parts of India. The reasons which induced him to conceive the idea of a political organization like the Indian National Congress were of an entirely different character. He was deeply impressed by the general discontent in India threatening imminent danger to the Government. "From well-wishers in different parts of the country he received warnings of the danger to the Government, and to the future welfare of India, from the economic sufferings of the masses, and the alienation of the intellectuals."[10] A memorandum, preserved among the papers of Hume, describes in detail, how, about fifteen months before the end of Lord Lytton's administration, he (Hume) got very definite information about the seething discontent among the masses from some religious devotees, held in highest veneration by the people. They approached him "because they feared that the ominous unrest throughout the country which pervaded even the lowest strata of the population, would lead to some terrible outbreak, destructive to India's future, unless men like him, who had access to the Government, could do something to remove the general feeling of despair and thus avert a catastrophe".[11]

The evidence which convinced Hume of "the imminent danger of a terrible outbreak" was contained in seven large volumes which were shown to him. These contained a vast number of communications from over thirty thousand different reporters from the different parts of India. These seemed to indicate that even men of the lowest classes, "convinced that they would starve and die", were determined to "do something, and that something was violence". "Innumerable entries referred to the secretion of old swords, spears and matchlocks, which would be ready when required. It was not supposed that the immediate result, in its initial stages, would be a revolt against our Government, or a revolt at all, in the proper sense of the word. What was predicted was a sudden violent outbreak of sporadic crimes, murders of obnoxious persons, robbery of bankers, looting of bazaars. In the existing state of the lowest half-starving classes, it was considered that the first few crimes would be the signal for hundreds of similar ones, and for a general development of lawlessness, paralysing the authorities and the respectable classes. It was considered certain, also, that everywhere the small bands would begin to coalesce into large ones, like drops of water on a leaf; that all the bad characters in the country would join, and that very soon after the bands obtained formidable proportions. certain small number of the educated classes, at the time desperately, perhaps unreasonably, bitter against the Government, would join the movement. assume here and there the lead, give the outbreak cohesion and direct it as a national revolt".[12]

Hume now "became convinced that some definite action was called for to counteract the growing unrest." "He, however, waited until, by his retirement from the service he should be free to act." Hume retired from Government service in 1882, and on 1 March, 1883, addressed an open letter to the graduates of the Calcutta University.[13] It was indeed a soul-stirring appeal to the educated Indians and every line of it bespeaks the genuine heart-felt yearning of a foreigner for the upliftment of India. "Whether in the individual or the nation", said he, "all vital progress must spring from within, and it is to you, her most cultured and enlightened minds, her most favoured sons, that your country must look for the initiative. In vain may aliens, like myself, love India and her children, as well as the most loving of these; in vain may they, for her and their good. give time and trouble, money and thought; in vain may they struggle and sacrifice; they may assist with advice and suggestion, they may place their experience, abilities and knowledge at the disposal of the workers. but they lack the essential of nationality and the real work must ever be done by the people of the country themselves". Hume then enlarged upon the necessity of an organization: "Scattered individuals, however capable and however well-meaning, are powerless singly. What is needed is union, organization, and to secure these an association is required, armed and organized with unusual care, having for its object to promote the mental. moral, social and political regeneration of the people of India". "If only fifty men, good and true, can be found to join as founders, the thing can be established and the future development will be comparatively easy". "If you, the picked men, the most highly educated of the nation, cannot, scorning personal ease and selfish objects, make a resolute struggle to secure greater freedom for yourselves and your country, a more impartial administration, a larger share in the management of your own affairs,. . . then, at present at any rate, all hopes of progress are at an end, and India truly neither lacks nor deserves any better government than she now enjoys. Only...let there be no more complaints of Englishmen being preferred to you in all important offices, for if you lack that public spirit. that highest form of altruistic devotion that leads men to subordinate private ease to the public weal, that true patriotism that has made Englishmen what they are,—then rightly are these preferred to you, and rightly and inevitably have they become your rulers. And rulers and taskmasters they must continue, let the yoke gall your shoulders never so sorely. until you realize and stand prepared to act upon the eternal truth that, whether in the case of individuals or nations, self-sacrifice and unselfishness are the only unfailing guides to freedom and happiness".

"This appeal", the biographer of Hume informs us, "was not made in vain. The men required as founders to initiate the movement were forthcoming from all parts of India; and the 'Indian National Union' was formed." It was this Union which was instrumental in summoning the first Indian National Congress. But before proceeding to describe that it is necessary to discuss a few preliminary points. The circular letter issued by Hume undoubtedly advocates the setting up of an organization which, among other things, should aim at the "political regeneration of the people of India". But, according to his biographer, "whereas he (Hume) was himself disposed to begin his reform propaganda on the social sidé, it was apparently by Lord Dufferin's advice that he took up the work of political organisation, as the matter first to be dealt with".[14] This view is also supported by W. C. Bonnerjee, the first President of the Congress, who says:

> "It will probably be news to many that the Indian National Congress, as it was originally started and as it has since been carried on, is in reality the work of the Marquis of Dufferin and Ava, when that nobleman was the Governor-General of India. Mr. A. O. Hume, C. B., had in 1884 conceived the idea that it would be of great advantage to the country if leading politicians could be brought together once a year to discuss social matters and be upon friendly footing with one another. He did not desire that politics should form part of their discussion, for, there were recognised political bodies in Calcutta, Bombay, Madras and other parts of India........Full of these ideas he saw the noble Marquis when he went to Simla early in 1885. Lord Dufferin took great interest in the matter, and after considering it for some time he sent for Mr. Hume and told him that in his opinion Mr. Hume's project would not be of much use. He said there was no body of persons in this country who performed the functions which Her Majesty's Opposition did in England ... It would be very desirable in their interests as well as the interests of the ruled that Indian politicians should meet yearly and point out to the Government in what respect the administration was defective and how it could be improved, and he added that an assembly such as he proposed should not be presided over by the Local Governor, for in his presence the people might not like to speak out their minds. Mr. Hume was convinced by Lord Dufferin's arguments, and when he placed the two schemes, his own and Lord Dufferin's, before leading politicians in Calcutta, Bombay, Madras and other parts of the country, the latter unanimously accepted Lord Dufferin's scheme and proceeded to give effect to it. Lord Dufferin had made it a condition with Mr. Hume that his name should not be divulged so long as he remained in the country".[15]

A somewhat different version is given by Professor Sundar Raman who attended the first session of the Indian National Congress. According to him Hume's original idea was to rouse the conscience of the people of England by carrying on a persistent agitation in Great Britain. When Mr. Hume talked about this to Lord Dufferin he expressed his opinion that such an agitation in England was foredoomed to failure, and convinced Hume that the latter could secure his own aims best by confining the agitation to India for the present, and by making Indian public men all over the land to start and develop to its full strength a national organization in India itself conducted with zeal and discretion by her own leaders under Mr. Hume's sympathetic and courageous lead.[16]

Curiously enough, Lord Dufferin himself contradicts both these views and categorically states that he thought the Congress should direct its attention only to social questions. This is clear from the following passage in his famous speech at St. Andrews Day Dinner on November 30, 1888: "When the Congress was first started, I watched its operations with interest and curiosity, and I hoped that in certain fields of useful activity it might render valuable assistance to the Government. I was aware that there were many social topics connected with the habits and customs of the people which were of unquestionable utility, but with which it was either undesirable for the Government to interfere, or which it was beyond their power to influence or control.....When Congress was first started, it seemed to me that such a body, if they directed their attention with patriotic zeal to these (social questions) and cognate subjects, as similar Congresses do in England, might prove of assistance to the Government and of great use to their fellow-citizens; and I cannot help expressing my regret that they should seem to consider such momentous topics, concerning as they do the welfare of millions of their fellow-subjects, as beneath their notice, and that they should have concerned themselves instead with matters in regard to which their assistance is likely to be less profitable to us.."[17] Further, the view that Hume's original plan was to set up merely a non-political organization cannot be easily reconciled with his "appeal" referred to above, and possibly Dufferin's share in this project has been misunderstood or exaggerated. But there is no doubt whatsoever that the Congress was really designed by Hume to arrest the progress of a revolutionary outbreak. Wedderburn clearly states this in his biography of Hume: "These ill-starred measures of reaction combined with Russian methods of Police repression, brought India under Lord Lytton within measurable distance of a revolutionary outbreak, and it was only in time that Mr. Hume and his Indian advisers were inspired to intervene."[18]

This passage leaves no doubt as to the real motive which inspired Hume to set up the Congress organization with the advice and blessings of the Viceroy, Lord Dufferin. So far as its political objectives were concerned, it was not intended to subserve the object of securing representative government for India such as inspired the National Conference in Calcutta, nor was it actuated by the more moderate desire of training the Indians in Parliamentary form of Government, as has so often been claimed. It was solely designed to hold back the Indian intelligentsia from joining an apprehended general outbreak against the British. Hume candidly expressed it himself in the following words: "A safety-valve for the escape of great and growing forces, generated by our own action, was urgently needed, and no more efficacious safety-valve than our Congress movement could possibly be devised."[19]

Thus whereas the National Conference of Calcutta was the culmination of a genuine political movement extending over half a century, the Indian National Congress, which otherwise resembled it, was suddenly brought into existence as an instrument to safeguard the British rule in India. To many Indians of the twentieth century it may appear strange that in spite of all this the Indian leaders chose the Congress as their national organization rather than the National Conference. The explanation probably lies in the unequal progress of political ideas in those days in different parts of the country, as was clearly shown by public reaction to the Ilbert Bill in different provinces of India, as noted above. There were evidently many Indian leaders who could not yet reconcile themselves to the advanced political ideas of the Indian Association of Calcutta. This is indicated by the exclusion of men like Surendra-nath Banerji at the inception of the movement, and the selection, as the first President of the Congress, of W. C. Bannerjee of Calcutta who had kept aloof from the Indian Association.

There was probably another consideration which weighed with those who responded to the clarion call of Hume. The Government, they rightly thought, would not look with kindly eyes upon any political organization of the Indians, demanding substantial reforms in the administration. But if the leading part were taken by an Englishman, who once held a high office, the hostility of the official class could be considerably neutralized. The great Indian political leader, Gokhale, gave expression to this view when he said: "No Indian could have started the Indian National Congress... If an Indian had come forward to start such a movement embracing all India, the officials in India would not have allowed the movement to come into existence. If the founder of the Congress had not been a great Englishman and a distinguished ex-official, such was the distrust of political agitation in those days that the authorities would have at once found some way or the other of suppressing the movement."[20] This feeling also probably influenced, to a large extent, the organizers of the National Conference in Calcutta to merge it in the Indian National Congress.

In any event there is no doubt that once Hume set the ball rolling, it gathered a momentum beyond expectation. Hume himself generously referred in his public speeches to the help he had received from Indian leaders. The Congress movement, he said, was the outcome "of the labours of a body of cultured men mostly born natives of India".[21] It appears that he met and discussed his plans with a good many leaders of Bombay such as Badruddin Tyabji, Dadabhai Naoroji, Pherozeshah Mehta and K. T. Telang. But he did not consult Surendra-nath Banerji. According to B. C. Pal, Hume had a personal dislike for Surendra-nath, partly for his dismissal from Government service and partly for his advanced political views. The Government of the day did not like the political advance made in Bengal and Surendra-nath was definitely in their black list. These considerations might have also dissuaded the other more moderate Indian leaders of those days from associating themselves with the "extremist" Surendra-nath. No other Indian leader had done so much to foster the idea of an all-India political organization such as the Congress was intended to be. Yet he does not seem to have been taken into confidence by Hume along with the others named above. In any case, there can be hardly any doubt that Surendra-nath was deliberately kept out of this organization at its initial stage. This fact as well as the selection of W. C. Bonnerjee as the President of the first Congress gives a fair idea of the political outlook of the founders of the Congress. Mr. Bonnerjee lived the life of an Englishman and not only kept himself aloof from, but almost ridiculed, all sorts of political agitation. He was not even a member of the Indian Association, the premier political organization of Bengal. According to B. C. Pal, Mr. Bonnerjee "never appreciated the labours of Surendranath. In fact, it was an open secret in those days that Mr. Bonnerjee was not in favour of inviting Surendranath and the leaders of the Indian Association to the first session of the Congress in Bombay."[22]

As Dufferin was intimately associated with the inauguration of the Congress, his views about the politics of Surendra-nath might have something to do with the exclusion of that great leader from the first or inaugural session of the Congress. Writing to Lord Cross, the Secretary of State, on 26 April, 1886, i.e. within four months of the Congress session. Dufferin praised the "moderate" Association formed by Sir Jatindra Mohan Tagore, who "have no desire to embarrass the Government". Then Dufferin adds: "But besides them is a more violent and less respectable party, headed, as far as I can make out, by Mr. Surendranath Banerji, who is connected with a cleverly-conducted but vicious paper called the Mirror". Dufferin then further denounces Surendra-nath and his party, his wrath being presumably directed against the activities of the Indian Association.

While all this may explain the attitude of the sponsors of the Congress towards Surendra-nath, it is not easy to explain why the National Conference silently merged itself in the Congress. The political leaders of Bengal could legitimately claim recognition for the former as the national forum of all India and dispute, on valid grounds, the necessity of starting a new institution. That apprehensions of such a squabble proved baseless reflects the highest credit on Surendra-nath and his colleagues. This self-abnegation or self-sacrifice on their part was inspired by a high sense of patriotism, and it is not unlikely that there were weighty political considerations behind the move. The British decried the political agitation in India as solely inspired by the cowardly Bengalis, and claimed that the sturdy military races were all against it. Surendra-nath says in his autobiography: "We wanted to dissipate this myth. To-day it stands exploded by the creation of the Congress." These two cryptic statements perhaps account for the readiness with which the political leaders of Bengal gave up their own organization and joined the Congress. The National Conference was, after all, a creation of Bengal, and in spite of its all-India character, the hostile critics, particularly the British, would never cease to represent it merely as a handiwork of the Bengali agitators. An organization sponsored by a British civilian and Indian leaders, without any special association with any particular province, was more likely to command great respect as an independent all-India organization than the National Conference.

These considerations gained additional strength from the fact that the new organization was started under the auspices of an Englishman, and was therefore sure to enjoy the blessings of the small group of public men in England who sympathised with the cause of India. Indian politicians of all shades of opinion had in those days an unbounded faith in the honesty and sense of justice of Englishmen. The Englishmen, they thought, had only to be convinced of the justice of Indian demands, and our salvation would not be long in coming. Besides, a special prestige was attached in those days to an English name. They would therefore naturally welcome the movement which was initiated by an Englishman.[22a]

In conclusion, reference should be made to a view which seeks to give an entirely different and very unfavourable interpretation of the activity of Hume in connection with the Indian National Congress. The propounder of this view, Dr. N. L. Chatterji, starts with a proposition which may appear to be very startling indeed, but in view of what has been said above, merits serious consideration. It may be stated in his own words:

"An inquiry into the available evidence leads one to suppose that Mr. Hume's real originality lay not so much in the propounding of the idea of an Indian National Congress, for the Indian Association of Calcutta, founded in 1876, had already arranged for the Indian National Conference in 1883 at the instance of Mr. Surendranath Banerjea, but that his achievement was the bypassing of the aforesaid Indian National Conference and the formation of an admittedly loyalist organisation apart from, and independent of, the existing body. It seemed, as if Mr. Hume was out to sabotage the Indian National Confenence sponsored by 'a dismissed Government servant', Mr. Surendranath Banerjea, and controlled by 'Babus from Bengal'. The student of Indian history is entitled to ask why a parallel body with an identical programme had to be brought into existence, even though the National Conference was going to hold an all-India Session at Calcutta in the Christmas week of 1885—the same fateful week which saw the birth of the Congress at Bombay."

Dr. Chatterji then answers the question himself: "The Congress was founded in fact as a precautionary move against an apprehended Russian invasion of India." In support of his view he quotes the following statement of Lord Ripon:

"... ... As the Russians approach our frontiers more nearly, they may try to stir up discontent and trouble by intrigues carried on within our dominions, and the real question, therefore, is how can such intrigue be best met and defeated". Dr. Chatterji points to the part played by Dufferin, as stated by W. C. Bonnerjee, and comments: "Evidently, the Congress was meant to be the long-awaited counterpoise to possible Russian intrigue in India." Dr. Chatterji finds support for his view in the address of W. W. Wedderburn as President of the Indian National Congress. Wedderburn undoubtedly implied that the Russians planned an attack of India in 1885 in order to test how far they could rely upon Indian support, but the Russian move was not followed by any signs of sympathy in India; and though Wedderburn does not say so, in Dr. Chatterji's opinion, he implies that it was the foundation of the Congress that led to this happy result. This may be true, but it is difficult to follow Dr. Chatterji when he asserts that Wedderburn "explicitly corroborated the fact that the foundation of the Congress was a move to safeguard India against the menace of Russian invasion." Similarly, Dr. Chatterji is right when he says that "the Congress became in its early years a platform for anti-Russian and pro-British propaganda". But the Congress merely reflected the public opinion in this respect and it would be very far-fetched indeed to derive from it any clue regarding the origin of the Congress. On the whole, it is difficult to attach much importance to Dr. Chatterji's view unless more positive evidence is forthcoming in support of it.[23]

II. THE FIRST TWENTY SESSIONS OF THE CONGRESS (1885-1904)

The Indian National Union, formed by Hume, as mentioned above, decided in March, 1885, to hold a conference at Poona from 25th to 31st December, and immediately issued a circular letter to this effect. "The leading politicians, well acquainted with the English language, from all parts of Bengal, Bombay and Madras Presidencies were invited to attend this conference whose objects were stated to be '(1) to enable all the most earnest labourers in the cause of national progress to become personally known to each other; and (2) to discuss and decide upon the political operations to be undertaken during the ensuing year.' It was also stated that subject to the unswerving allegiance to the British sovereign, the Union would oppose by all constitutional methods all official acts or measures opposed to those principles which were laid down by the Parliament. Lastly, a hope was expressed that 'indirectly this Conference will form the germ of a native Parliament and, if properly conducted, will constitute, in a few years, an unanswerable reply to the assertion that India is still wholly unfit for any form of representative institutions."[24]

On receipt of this circular letter, special committees were formed in a large number of towns in India, whose members or delegates, selected from among themselves, promised to attend the Conference. Hume then proceeded to England and succeeded in enlisting the sympathy and support of a number of liberal Englishmen. He also took steps to ensure wide publicity to the conference in the British Press before he returned to India.

On account of the outbreak of a cholera epidemic in Poona the venue of the conference was shifted to Bombay. Its name was changed to the 'Indian National Congress' and the first session was held on December 28, 1885. The total number of delegates who attended the session was about 72, but they were fairly representative of the different regions of India. According to the official proceedings, "all the leading native political associations and the principal Anglo-native newspapers were represented; there were members of Legislative Councils, Presidents and members of Municipal Committees and Local Boards." It is to be noted, however, that only a few Muslims attended the session and the delegates from Bengal were very small in number, presumably because the second session of the National Conference was held about the same time in Calcutta. The meeting was strictly confined to the delegates, the members of the public not being admitted even as spectators.[25]

W. C. Bonnerjee, who was elected President of the Congress, elaborated in his Presidential address the objects of the Congress under the following four heads:

"1. The promotion of personal intimacy and friendship amongst all the more earnest workers in our country's cause in the various parts of the Empire.

2. The eradication, by direct friendly personal intercourse, of all possible race, creed, or provincial prejudices amongst all lovers of our country, and the fuller development and consolidation of those sentiments of national unity that had their origin in their beloved Lord Ripon's ever memorable reign.

3. The authoritative record, after this has been carefully elicited by the fullest discussion, of the matured opinions of the educated classes in India on some of the more important and pressing of the social questions of the day.

4. The determination of the lines upon, and methods, by which, during the next twelve months, it is desirable for native politicians to labour in the public interests."[26]

The Congress then discussed and passed nine resolutions. The more important of these were in the forms of demands to the Government of India for the

1. Appointment of a Royal Commission to inquire into the working of Indian administration.
2. Abolition of the Indian Council (of the Secretary of State).
3. Creation of Legislative Councils for the North-West Provinces and Oudh and the Punjab.
4. Admission of a considerable proportion of elected members to the Supreme and Local Legislative Councils with the right of interpellation and discussion of Budgets, and the creation of a Standing Committee in the House of Commons to consider formal protests from majorities in the Councils.

5. Reduction of military expenditure and its equitable apportionment between India and England.
6. Introduction of simultaneous Public Service Examinations in England and India and the raising of the age of candidates.

The speeches were characterized by moderation and extreme (almost servile) effusions of loyalty to the British Crown. A number of Government officials took part in the drafting of the resolutions, and Justice Ranade of Bombay even spoke at the open session of the Congress.

The resolution formulating the fourth demand[27], mentioned above, was most hotly debated by a large number of delegates, and there was a wide divergence of opinion as to the best method of making India's voice heard in the British Parliament. The creation of a Standing Committee in the House of Commons, which was ultimately accepted, did not commend itself to many. Narendra-nath Sen very cogently argued that "a Standing Committee of the House of Commons would be good if we had representatives of our own in the House". As an alternative proposal he suggested that "there might be a small Parliament in India with many Indian members. Indian political bodies should be asked to name such members and also have a voice in the formation of the existing Executive Councils".

In spite of the moderation and loyalty of the Congresss, the English public opinion looked upon the emergence of the Congress as a potential danger to the British power in India. An editorial in *The Times* of London frankly stated that to concede the demands of the Congress was tantamount to the grant of Home Rule in India, and the British would never retire from India in favour of those who could only talk. A long extract from this editorial has been quoted in the next section of this Chapter. The comment of *The Times* foredoomed to failure the methods pursued by the Congress and was a correct forecast of the attitude of studied indifference which the Government adopted towards the resolutions passed by the Congress year after year—the 'hardy annuals', as someone characterised them.

The Times as well as its Bombay correspondent drew pointed attention to the fact that not a single Muslim member joined the Congress. K. T. Telang, on behalf of the Congress, pointed out that the statement was inaccurate, as two leading Muslim gentlemen —R. M. Sayani and A. M. Dharamsi—did attend the Congress. But this refutation was hardly less damaging than the original accusation. It is interesting to note in this connection that in a letter dated 31

December, 1885, i.e. almost immediately after the first session of the Congress was over, the Bombay correspondent of the London *Times*, recorded his impression of it as follows: "Its congeries of races, its diversity of castes, all seemed to find common ground in their political aspirations. Only one great race was conspicuous by its absence, the Mahomedans of India were not there. They remained steadfast in their habitual separation. They certainly do not yield to either Hindu or Parsee in their capacity for development, but they persistently refuse to act in common with the rest of the Indian subjects of the Queen-Empress. Not only in their religion, but in their schools and almost all their colleges and all their daily life they maintain an almost haughty reserve. The reason is not hard to find. They cannot forget that less than two centuries ago they were the dominant race, while their present rivals in progress only counted as so many millions of tax-paying units who contributed each his mite to swell their glory of Islam."[28]

The main result of the first session of the Congress was that it quickened the political consciousness of the people. The resolutions passed by it were widely circulated and discussed by the local political associations. The newspapers also heartily welcomed the new organization as the most powerful organ of Indian political opinion, and put forward various suggestions for the consideration of the next Congress. The result of all this was clearly perceived in the second session of the Congress which met in Calcutta on 28 December with Dadabhai Naoroji as President. The number of delegates attending the session was about 440,[29] more than six times that of the first session. The eminent political leader Surendra-nath took an active part in this session[30], and henceforth proved to be one of the strongest pillars of the Congress organization, like Dadabhai and Pherozeshah Mehta. The conservative British Indian Association of Calcutta joined the Congress but the National Muhammadan Association of Bengal held aloof, and the Muslims, as a class, deliberately abstained from taking any part in the Indian National Congress.

The second session of the Congress marked a distinct advance over the first. The men who attended the first Congress at Bombay had no representative character—they were only volunteers. The second Congress was composed of delegates, elected at public meetings held for the purpose in different provinces. "Five hundred delegates were elected, of whom 434 actually registered their names and credentials as present."[30a] This procedure has continued ever since and the method of electing delegates has been clearly formulated from time to time. Another innovation was the admission of the public as spectators of the proceedings. A third novel feature was also introduced. "Various circulars were issued suggesting subjects for discussion and outlining proposals, so that delegates might not come unprepared—a plan that, unfortunately, fell into desuetude."[30b]

Bengal naturally sent the largest number of delegates, namely, 230. Next came N.W.P. and Oudh with 74. Bombay, Madras, Punjab, C. P. and Assam sent, respectively, 47, 47, 17, 8 and 8.

The great scholar and antiquarian, Rajendra-lal Mitra, was the Chairman of the Reception Committee. In his address of welcome he observed: "We live, not under a National Government, but under a foreign bureaucracy; our foreign rulers are foreigners by birth, religion, language, habits, by everything that divides humanity into different sections. They cannot ascertain our wants, our feelings, our aspirations." The Congress received the blessings of Devendranath Tagore, a great religious and political leader of the previous generation, and Jay-krishna Mukherji, the head of a distinguished aristocratic family of Zamindars in Bengal—an old man of 79, "blind and trembling with age."

The Congress passed a resolution drawing attention to the increasing poverty of the people. D. E. Wacha, who moved it, pointed out that 40 millions of people had only one meal a day, and not always that. The Congress, by another resolution, reiterated the demand for the expansion of the Legislative Councils and laid down elaborate principles according to which it should be carried into effect. It demanded enlarged powers for the Legislative Councils and an increase of members, not less than one-half of whom should be elected.

The Congress appointed a Committee to consider the question of recruitment for Public Services and recommended open competitive examination, that for the senior services being held simultaneously in India and in England.

A distinct change in the tone and spirit of the Congress was noticeable during its session at Calcutta, and this was undoubtedly due to the greater advance in political life in Bengal during the preceding half-a-century, as noted above. Although the first Congress was held at Bombay, and prominent political leaders of Bengal were absent, the idea was already growing that in demanding political rights the Congress only echoed the voice of Bengal. Malik Bhagavan Das from Dehra Ismail Khan protested against this and, drawing up his body in N. W. Frontier dress, asked: "Do I look like a Bengali Babu?" He then said that all the more intelligent persons wanted the reforms demanded by the Congress.

Nevertheless, the idea persisted. Syed Ahmad Khan of Aligarh tried to dissuade the Musalmans from joining the third session of the Congress on the ground that it was dominated by the Bengalis and the satisfaction of its demands would lead to Bengali rule. In a speech delivered on the eve of the third session at Madras to a Muslim audience he said: "If you accept that the country should groan under the yoke of Bengali rule and its people lick the Bengali shoes, then, in the name of God! jump into the train, sit down, and be off to Madras."[30c] The Viceroy, Lord Dufferin, also referred to such a feeling entertained by the Muslims in a letter to the Secretary of State, dated 4 January, 1887, i.e. immediately after the Calcutta session of the Congress: "You will have observed that the Mahomedans have abstained from taking any part in the Indian National Congress .... What the Mahomedans feel is that under a Bengalee constitution they would be more completely left out in the cold than they are at present." Three years later, Malleson, the great English historian of the Mutiny, described the Congress as "started by the noisy Bengalis" and its demands for representative institutions as 'utterly abhorrent to the manly races of India like the Sikhs, Rajputs, Rohillas, Jats, and the frontier Pathan tribes.'[30d]

Whatever we might think of these criticisms, there is no doubt that the Congress was invigorated by the political traditions and achievements in Bengal.

It is interesting to note the reaction of the Viceroy, Lord Dufferin, to the Congress session in Calcutta. In his letter to the Secretary of State, Lord Cross, dated 4 January, 1887, mentioned above, he referred to some of the resolutions as extravagant. He also described the discussions as very childish, reminding "rather of an Eton or Harrow Debating Society than even of Oxford or Cambridge Union".

But this letter is not altogether devoid of interest. In his Presidential Address, Dadabhai Naoroji had regretted the refusal of the Government to grant the prayer of the first Congress for a Royal Commission of inquiry. But in his letter to Cross, Dufferin assumed that there would be a Parliamentary Commission on Indian affairs. It is in this letter, again, that Dufferin recommended, for the first time, election of Indian members of the Legislative Councils, in place of nomination, and an increase in their number. Coming immediately after the Congress session in Calcutta, the idea of Dufferin may be looked upon as being influenced by that body. This view is strengthened by the following lines in the same letter:

"A concession of the kind now would stop a good deal of agitation. Of course to political agitation in India we can afford to be more or less indifferent at present, though I am by no means certain that this will continue to be the case."

On the whole, it may be fairly presumed that the Calcutta session of the Congress set in motion the ideas of the Viceroy which ultimately led to the Indian Councils Act of 1892.

The third session, held at Madras, was presided over by an eminent Muslim leader, Badruddin Tyabji, who later rose to be a judge of the Bombay High Court. The number of delegates rose to 607, and the need was felt for drawing up a regular constitution of the Congress. But though a Committee of 34 members was set up for this purpose, no regular constitution was adopted during the next twenty years. The difficulty caused by the absence of such constitution was brought to a head by the strong opposition made by a group of young delegates to the current practice of leaving to a few senior delegates the task of preparing drafts of resolutions to be moved at the public session. The opposition was somewhat violent in character, and ultimately it was decided to set up at the opening of each session of the Congress a small representative committee in order to fix up the programme and prepare the draft of the resolutions to be placed before the plenary session of the Congress. This was the genesis of the "Subjects Committee" which henceforth became a regular feature of the Congress, and made the first breach in the strong citadel of orthodox and conservative leadership of the Congress.[31]

Perhaps the most significant feature of the third session was the eloquent appeal made by the President to his Muslim co-religionists to join the Congress. In his Presidential address, Tyabji ably answered the reproach made against the previous two sessions of the Congress that the Muslims had kept aloof from them. He urged them to work hand in hand with the other communities of India, and hoped that in future the Muslims would not stand aloof from the others in their joint efforts to secure "those great general rights which are for the common benefit of us all..." The appeal of the Muslim President to his co-religionists did not go in vain. The Muslims, who had held aloof from the first two sessions, joined in large numbers in the fourth. It did not, however, remove their nervous fear of the Hindus as will be seen from the proceedings of the fifth session, described later.

The Indian National Congress passed a number of resolutions in each session, but the Government of India paid no heed to them. There was no doubt that the official attitude towards the Congress had undergone a change. Some officials attended the first session, but when, in the second session at Calcutta, invitation cards were sent to the Government House, they were returned on the ground that the officials could not attend the meetings of a political body.

Lord Dufferin, however, explained away this action and even invited the delegates of the Congress, not as such but as distinguished visitors, to a garden party. The Governor of Madras also did the same. But in spite of this politeness, there was no sympathetic response from the side of the Government to the demands of the Congress for reforms, repeated year after year. This chilled the enthusiasm of some and caused irritation to others. Among the latter group was Hume himself. He was shocked and pained by the stolid indifference displayed by the Government, and no less by the undisguised hostility shown towards the Congress by the official circles and the minority communities in India, who represented the Congress movement as an attempt to subvert the Government and establish a Hindu Raj.

"To the ardent mind of Mr. Hume platonic expressions of sympathy by the authorities were a mockery while nothing practical was being done" to relieve the misery of the masses. "The sufferings of the Indian masses from famine and disease arose from poverty; and this poverty was preventible, if the Government would take into their counsels experienced representatives of the people". But the Government refused to do this, while "deaths by famine and pestilence were counted, not by tens of thousands, or by hundreds of thousands, but by millions". In this great predicament Hume rose to the height of his stature as a political leader. He decided that, "in order to constrain the Government to move", the leaders of the Indian people must follow "the drastic methods pursued in England by Bright and Cobden in their great campaign on behalf of the people's food".[32]

"The educated men, the Press, and the Congress", said Hume, "have endeavoured to instruct the Government, but the Government, like all autocratic Governments, has refused to be instructed, and it will now be for us to instruct the nations, the great English nation in the island home, and the far greater nation of this vast continent, so that every Indian that breathes upon the sacred soil of this our motherland may become our comrade and coadjutor, our supporter, and if needs be our soldier, in the great war that we, like Cobden and his noble band, will wage for justice, for our liberties and rights."[33]

In pursuance of such a propaganda Mr. Hume, according to his biographer, set to work "with his wonted energy, appealing for funds to all classes of Indian community, distributing tracts, leaflets, and pamphlets, sending out lecturers and calling meetings both in large towns and in country districts." Throughout the country over thousand meetings were held, many of which were attended by more than five thousand persons. Of the numerous pamphlets attention may be drawn to two which were widely distributed and created considerable stir at the time. These were entitled "A Congress Catechism" and "A Conversation between Maulvi Furreduddin and one Ram Buksh of Kambakhtpur". They vividly depicted the evils of absentee landlordism and despotic Government and pointed out that the only remedy of these evils was the representative Government for which the Congress was fighting. These pamphlets contained bitter attacks against Government and were not as harmless as some have represented them to be.[34]

The mass movement inaugurated by Hume made the official attitude towards the Congress definitely antagonistic. Hume defended his action in a speech at a meeting at Allahabad on 30 April, 1888, which was published under the title, "A Speech on the Indian National Congress, its Origin, Aims, and Objects".[35] This only added fuel to the flame, and excitement ran very high among the reactionary class of officials who "desired to suppress the Congress" and even "recommended that Mr. Hume should be deported."[36] Even Sir Auckland Colvin, Lieutenant-Governor of the North-Western Provinces, who was hitherto "distinctly friendly to the Congress movement", was very much perturbed by this active political propaganda among the masses. It gave rise to the historic correspondence between Colvin and Hume in October, 1888, later published as a pamphlet under the title of *Audi Alteram Partem.* Colvin's criticisms were directed against the methods and not against the principles or objects of the Congress, which he generally approved. He considered the mass propaganda "premature and mischievous", but Hume considered it necessary for the safety of the State. As the biographer of Hume has pointed out, the difference was irreconcilable. For while Hume looked at the whole question from the point of view of the Indians, with whom he identified himself after his retirement from the service, Colvin's outlook was that of a British administrator. Hume wrote to Colvin: "You still look through the rose-tinted official spectacles that so long obscured my sight. But leave the service, mix freely with the people, and you would wholly change your views".

In fairness to Colvin it must be mentioned here that even a class of Indian leaders, including Bipin Chandra Pal, who was destined to be a leader of the Extremist party in Indian politics, shared his views at the time. The following passage in his autobiography explains his motive:

"In the Hume-Colvin controversy I took some little part, writing to the press practically supporting Sir Auckland Colvin in his warning against drawing the masses to this political movement. I held that it would be a dangerous thing not only for the British Government, but also for India, if the masses were to be imbued with antagonism to British rule through our political agitations. Mr. W. C. Bonnerjee had declared in course of a public utterance that one of the objects of the Congress was to 'lower the British Government in the estimation of the people'. I found it impossible to accept much less to support this view of the aims of the Congress".

Referring to the "price of allegiance to the ideals of social reform such as the Brahmo Samaj had to pay", B. C. Pal continues: "The principle of complete religious freedom inculcated by the British Government in India secured to the Brahmo Samaj this right, and the general body of the Brahmos, therefore, were grateful to Providence for the establishment of the new political power in the country, which was regarded by them, in those days, as a great moral influence. This was really the psychology of the Brahmo leader, Keshub Chandra Sen, when he proclaimed 'loyalty to the Government' as one of the fundamental articles of the creed of his new church. Though not openly subscribing to it or incorporating it as an article of their religious faith the general body of the Brahmos of those days were frankly afraid of a return to Hindu or Moslem rule in India. This is why I joined in the protest raised by Sir Auckland Colvin against the kind of mass political propaganda that had been started by the Congress in 1887. The Congress leaders in those days had little or no sensing of the danger of exciting the masses against the existing British rule. On the eve of the Congress at Allahabad I was prompted to sound this note of warning and, therefore, organised an address to be delivered at the Kayastha Pathsala Hall with Babu Kali Charan Bannerjee in the chair.

"I went to the fundamental question whether India could reasonably expect to build up a real modern democracy by enlisting the masses to the service of the Congress before they were sufficiently advanced in social ideas and had been properly educated. The continuance of British authority was necessary for building up a real freedom movement in the country with a view to establishing a Government which would be government of the people, by the people and for the people".[37]

It would be interesting to note the reaction of Lord Dufferin to the unexpected vigour shown by his own pet child. He was sympathetic to the main objective of the Congress and actually recommended to the Home authorities a liberal reconstitution of the Legislative Council on the line recommended by the Congress. To this reference has been made above. But he, too, changed his views in 1888. In his famous speech at St. Andrews Dinner,[38] he described the Indian National Congress as representing a "microscopic minority" and denounced their claim to represent India. He even referred to the Congress ideal as a "very big jump into the unknown". His Lordship, in his valedictory address, declared that "in the present condition of India there can be no real or effective representation of the people with their enormous number, their multifarious interests and their tessellated minorities". He also, like Colvin, severely condemned the propaganda among the masses. It seems to be somewhat illogical to belittle the Congress as representing a microscopic minority, and at the same time to condemn its propaganda among the masses, the only means by which it could broadbase the movement on the wishes of the people. Yet this was precisely what Dufferin did.

The remarks of Dufferin on the Congress were specially unfortunate, coming, as it did, from one who had sponsored the movement only four years ago. His apologists have argued that his words did not convey his real views but were only meant for consumption at home, where the new constitution was then in the offing.[39] But whatever that may be, the unfortunate speech of Dufferin set the tone which was henceforth to be adopted by the Indian Government towards the Indian National Congress.

The changed attitude of the officials was clearly indicated in connection with the fourth session of the Congress at Allahabad, where Colvin reigned supreme. Pandit Ayudhya Nath, a prominent political worker and generally styled as the lion of U. P., was the Chairman of the Reception Committee. But he could not procure any suitable site for the Congress, as both the civil and military authorities threw obstacles in his way. At last the Maharaja of Darbhanga solved the difficulty by purchasing the Lowther Castle and placing it at the disposal of the Congress. The official opposition, manifested in various other "spiteful" acts of bureaucracy, unworthy of a Government, was backed up by the open hostility of Sir Syed Ahmad. This great leader, whose views and activities have been related in detail in Chapter VIII, joined by a loyal Hindu Zamindar, Raja Shiva Prasad, had set up a rival organization, styled United Indian Patriotic Association, in order to checkmate the Congress.[40] He asked the Muslims not to join the Congress, and the local officials not only held out the threat that anybody joining the Congress would come to grief, but also openly lent their help for the organization of anti-Congress meetings. But in spite of, or perhaps due to, this opposition, the fourth session of the Indian National Congress at Allahabad was a great success. Over 200 Muslims and more than one thousand other delegates attended. The President of the session was

George Yule, a British merchant of Calcutta. In his Presidential address he observed that every big movement like the Congress had to pass through three stages: the first is one of ridicule, the second, of partial concession with misrepresentation of aim, and the third is a substantial adoption of the movement with some expression of surprise that it was not adopted before. He then pointed out that the Congress had passed the first stage and was now in the second, when reforms were accompanied by warnings against taking "big jumps into the unknown". This was, of course, a reference to the St. Andrews Dinner speech of Lord Dufferin which came in for a great deal of scathing criticism during this session of the Congress.

The fifth session which met at Bombay in December, 1889, was attended by exactly 1889 delegates (a curious coincidence) and presided over by Sir William Wedderburn, the friend and biographer of Hume. This session was rendered memorable by the presence of Charles Bradlaugh, M.P., whose genuine pro-Indian attitude in the House of Commons has been referred to above.[41] He told the delegates that they constituted a living refutation of the charge often heard within the walls of Parliament that "there is no Indian people; there are only two hundred millions of diverse races and diverse creeds." A scheme of representative government was drafted in this session, but it raised the ugly head of communalism. A demand was made by a Muslim delegate that there should be an equal number of Hindu and Muslim members in the Imperial and Provincial Councils. It did not get much support, and even the majority of Muslim members voted against it.[42] But it was a bad omen for the future.

The Congress also resolved to send a deputation to England to place before the British public the views of the Congress about political reforms in India which were then being considered by the British Government.

Sir Pherozeshah Mehta, who presided over the sixth session at Calcutta (1890), put the case of the Congress in a nutshell when he said that it had survived the ridicule, abuse, misrepresentation and charges of sedition and disloyalty. "We have", he continued, "also survived the charge of being a 'microscopic minority'. We have survived the charge of being guilty of the atrocious crime of being educated, and we have even managed to survive the grievous charge of being all Babus in disguise".[43] The Chairman of the Reception Committee, Mono-mohan Ghose, condemned the British policy of "Divide and Rule" as "unworthy of the British people". It was also during this session that the Government of India, in order to remove misunderstanding of the official circle, publicly declared the Indian

National Congress to be "perfectly legitimate", representing, in terms of European politics, "the more advanced liberal party". It was also made clear that the Government servants could attend the Congress session, but not take any part in its deliberations; even this restriction was not applicable to the pension-holders.

Once more the stolid indifference of the Government to the Congress demands disheartened Hume, and in his despair he even thought of suspending the Congress. This idea was supported by a few on the ground that while the Congress had achieved no good results, it had irritated the Government and increased the tension between the Hindus and the Muslims. But the educated community in India repudiated the idea in no uncertain voice. Surendra-nath Banerji truly echoed their sentiments when he declared that "we should never abandon the Congress, the standard round which we have fought for the last eight years, the standard which we trust one day to carry proudly before us to victory".

The situation was somewhat improved by the passing of the Indian Councils Act of 1892. Disappointing though it was, it was regarded as the first victory of the Congress and its method of constitutional agitation. The hope of the Congress was further raised by the success of its efforts in Britain, to which reference will be made later. It was also heartened by the message of the Irish Home Rulers conveyed through Dadabhai Naoroji, the President of the Lahore Session: "Do not forget to tell your colleagues that the Ireland Home Rule members in Parliament are at your back in the cause of the Indian people."

Henceforth the Congress did never falter in its onward march from year to year, buoyed up with courage and hope for ultimate success. Though there was no essential change either in its ideal and outlook, or in its method of agitation, it came to be gradually recognized both by friends and foes, in India and in Britain, to be a potent force in the public life of India.

It is not necessary to describe the sessions of the Congress year after year, or to give an account of the various resolutions passed in them. A general account of the more important reforms demanded by the Congress during the first twenty years must suffice.

The demand for the abolition of the India Council, passed in the first session, was reiterated and a proposal was made to replace it by a Standing Committee of the House of Commons to advise the Secretary of State.

The Congress made persistent demands for expanding both the Supreme and Provincial Legislative Councils and increasing the popular element in them by election of non-official members. The various resolutions passed by the Congress on this subject from year to year have been quoted above[44]. When the Indian Councils Act was passed in 1892, the Congress regretted that it did not concede to the people the right of electing their own representatives to the Council, and expressed the hope "that the rules, now being prepared under the Act, will be framed on the lines of Mr. Gladstone's declaration in the House of Commons." In the next two sessions, in 1893 and 1894, the Congress passed resolutions, pointing out that 'material alterations are necessary alike in the rules of the Government of India and in the practice of most of the Local Governments if real effect is to be given to the spirit of the Act'.

In 1904, the Congress went one step further and demanded representation of Indians in the British House of Commons, each Province or Presidency of India returning at least two members. It also asked for "the appointment of Indian representatives (who shall be nominated by the elected members of the Legislative Councils) as members of the India Council in London and of the Executive Councils of the Government of India and the Governments of Bombay and Madras".

It is hardly necessary to add that year after year the Congress passed resolutions, protesting against the abuses, and urging for reforms, in the various branches of administration. The resolution for the separation of the Executive and Judicial functions was passed no less than ten times between 1886 and 1906. Trial by jury, reform of the police administration, reduction of salt tax and income-tax, extension of the Permanent Settlement, etc., formed the subjects of resolutions passed in many sessions. In 1898 the Congress expressed "its deep sense of disapproval of the reactionary policy of Government with regard to the Local Self-Government, recently inaugurated by the introduction of the Calcutta Municipal Bill into the Bengal Legislative Council, the creation of the Bombay City Improvement Trust without adequate popular representation, and its action in other directions." The general attitude of the Congress towards the British administrative system may be gathered from the following resolution adopted in 1891:

"That this Congress, concurring in the views set forth in previous Congresses, affirms—that fully fifty millions of the population, a number yearly increasing, are dragging out a miserable existence on the verge of starvation, and that, in every decade, several millions actually perish by starvation. That this unhappy condition is largely due to—

(a) The exclusion of the people of India from a due participation in the administration, and all control over the finances of their own country...

(b) The extravagant cost of the present administration, military and civil, but specially the former; and to

(c) a short-sighted system of Land Revenue administration, whereby not only is all improvement in the agriculture of the country, on which nine-tenths of the population depend for subsistence, rendered impossible, but the gradual deterioration of that agriculture assured.

"That hence it has become imperatively necessary—

That the cost of the administration be greatly reduced in the military branch, by a substantial reduction of the Standing Army, by the substitution of long-termed local European troops like those of the Hon. E.I. Company for the present short-term Imperial regiments with their heavy cost of recruitment in England, in transport and of the excessive mortality amongst non-acclimatized youths; by the cessation of the gigantic waste of money that has gone on now for several years, on so-called Frontier Defences, and by a strict economy in the Commissariat, Ordnance, and Store Departments; and in the Civil Branch, by the wide substitution of a cheaper indigenous agency for the extremely costly imported Staff; and that measures be at once taken to give, as was promised by the British Government thirty years ago, fixity and permanence to the Land Revenue demand and thus permit capital and labour to combine to develop the agriculture of the country, which, under the existing system of Temporary Settlements in recent times often lasting for short periods, in some cases only extending to 10 and 12 years, is found to be impossible; and to establish agricultural banks."

The resolution has been quoted at length as it indicates that the Indian National Congress fully represented the popular feelings about the condition of the masses, and that it did not merely indulge in destructive criticism but also made constructive suggestions with a view to removing the greatest evils of the British administration.

As mentioned above, the Congress was insistent in its demands for holding simultaneous examinations in London and India for admission to the Civil Service, and raising the maximum age for competitors[45]. The Congress placed on record "its deep regret at the resolution of the Government of India on the Report of the Public Service Commission" (appointed in 1886),[46] and pointed out in detail how the Government resolution had substantially reduced the number of higher appointments which were recommended by the Commission to be held by the Indians. It was resolved to send a petition to the House of Commons on the subject drawing its attention to the grave discontent caused by the Report of the Commission as well as the action of the Government.

The Congress guarded the interest of India like a vigilant watchdog, and never failed to record its emphatic protest against any measure likely to adversely affect the interest of India. Thus in 1894, in the Madras session, it protested against the "injustice and impolicy of imposing excise duty on cottons manufactured in British India, as such excise is calculated to cripple seriously the infant Mill industry in this country", and put on record its firm conviction that in proposing this excise "the interests of India have been sacrificed to those of Lancashire". Similar protests were recorded against many other Government measures which, in the opinion of the Congress, would inflict unnecessary and unjustified hardship on the people, or would injure their true interest.

III. THE BRITISH REACTION TO THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS

Since the inauguration of the Indian National Congress it represented the voice of the politically conscious India, and the British attitude towards it may be justly regarded as the touchstone of British liberalism and the key to the British policy towards India. The Indians were not left long in doubt as to what that attitude was likely to be. Almost immediately after the first session of the Congress was over, there was a leading article on the subject in *The Times* of London, the spokesman of the British people and the most renowned newspaper, in the whole world. The following extract from it may therefore be rightly interpreted as a very free and frank expression of general British opinion on the subject.

After summing up, in its own way, the various resolutions passed by the Congress, *The Times* comments:

"The first question which this series of resolutions will suggest is whether India is ripe for the transformation which they involve. If this can be answered in the affirmative, the days of English rule are numbered. If India can govern itself, our stay in the country is no longer called for. All we have to do is to preside over the construction of the new system and then to leave it to work. The lawyers and school masters and newspaper editors will step into the vacant place and will conduct affairs with no help from us. Those who know India will be the first to recognise the absurd impracticability of such a change. But it is to nothing less than this that the resolutions of the Congress point. If they were carried out, the result would soon be that very little would remain to England except the liability which we should have assumed for the entire Indian debt. Then, however, would be the time at which the representative character of the late Congress would be subjected to a crucial test. Our correspondent tells us that the delegates fairly represent the education and intellectual power of India. That they can talk, and that they can write, we are in no doubt at all. The whole business of their lives has been a training for such work as this. But that they can govern wisely, or that they can enforce submission to their rule, wise or unwise, we are not equally sure. That the entire Mahomedan population of India has steadily refused to have anything to do with them is a sufficiently ominous fact. Even if the proposed changes were to stop short of the goal to which they obviously tend, they would certainly serve to weaken the vigour of the Executive and to make the good government of the country a more difficult business than it has ever been. The Viceroy's Council already includes some nominated native members. To throw it open to elected members, and to give minorities a statutable right to be heard before a Parliamentary Committee would be an introduction of Home Rule for India in about as troublesome a form as could be devised. Do what we will, the government of India cannot be made constitutional. If it works well, neither England nor India can have any reason to be dissatisfied with it. The educated classes may find fault with their exclusion from full political rights. Political privileges they can obtain in the degree in which they prove themselves deserving of them. But *it was by force that India was won, and it is by force that India must be governed,* in whatever hands the government of the country may be vested. *If we were to withdraw, it would be in favour not of the most fluent tongue or of the most ready pen, but the strongest arm and the sharpest sword.* It would, perhaps, be well for the members of the late Congress to reconsider their position from this practical point of view."[47]

The outburst of *The Times* is of more than passing interest. Its fundamental assumptions were that the Congress demands for the political reforms were tantamount to Home Rule, and that the Indians were by no means fit for it. As was pointed out at the time in the *Quarerly Journal* of the Poona Sārvajanik Sabhā,[48] the people of the neighbouring island of Ceylon enjoyed far greater political rights and privileges than the Indians, though both were under the British Crown. In Ceylon there was no such racial discrimination in the eye of the law as was sought to be prevented by the Ilbert Bill. The maximum age for candidates at the competitive examination for Civil Service was 24 instead of 19 as in India. Ceylon had already effected the disestablishment of the English Church which received no grant from the public exchequer. The most important point in the present context was the character of the Legislative Council in Ceylon as compared with that in India. The Ceylon Council was more representative in character as the non-official members were elected, not nominated. It possessed the right of interpellating on executive matters, and complete control over finances, as the annual budget required the sanction of the legislature. The result was that Ceylon, unlike India, had not to bear the cost of Abhyssinian War and Egyptian expedition, or the expenses for the entertainment of the Sultan of Turkey in London. After pointing out all these differences the Journal pertinently asked the question whether the preferential treatment to the Ceylonese is justified by their superiority to the Indian in any respect.

The Times would have been hard put to it to answer this question. It would be difficult to maintain that the Ceylonese have ever been more distinguished than the Indians, either in regard to political ability or in cultural progress. As a matter of fact, Ceylon is contiguous to India and may be regarded, for all practical purposes, as part and parcel of India. Its population always contained a very strong element of Indians as it does today. These facts could not have possibly been unknown to the editor of *The Times.* To denounce as preposterous the general political demands of the Indians formulated by the Congress, which did not substantially exceed what was already enjoyed by the Ceylonese, betokened a deep-seated policy of never relinquishing the hold on India. This alone satisfactorily explains the attitude maintained by the British Government towards India. The writer of the letters to the *Englishman,* mentioned above,[49] and the article in *The Times,* in an unguarded moment, let the cat out of the bag; but they truly represented the real British policy, which was usually hidden under a cloak of liberalism and sweet phrases. Through these, and not through the liberal group of Fawcett, Bright and others, spoke the real voice of Britannia.

The British people were as usual apathetic to the demands of the Congress. Lord Ripon wrote to Sir Henry Cotton from England to this effect in 1887 as follows: "I fully share your opinion as to the importance of the reorganization of the Legislative Councils. But to obtain any attention to that or any other Indian question from the people of this country at the present time is simply impossible. Men's thoughts, so much at least of them as they are able to give to politics, are totally absorbed now upon Irish affairs, and they have not five minutes to give to any other matter whatsoever, let alone the affairs of India".[50] This was distinctly to the advantage of the officials both in India and England. "Not only was the India Office opposed to Indian reforms, but many of its operations were conducted under cover of secrecy. As Florence Nightingale wrote to Wedderburn (referring to Randolph Churchill, who was Secretary of State for India in 1885), "Lord Randolph, the 'Boy with the drum', is doing untold harm—literally untold, because the India Office is a secret society."[51]

Lord Salisbury (who had been Secretary of State for India from 1874, during the period of the passage of the Vernacular Press Act, and Prime Minister from 1886 to 1892) expressed his opposition to the Congress in a memorandum in 1888 regarding the granting of legislative powers to elected councillors. He said: "I think I am not wrong in assuming that the men who will be brought to the fore by this plan will be (in Bengal) Bengalee lawyers, agents, newspaper writers... In India they are the class among whom disaffection is the strongest, and they are most competent to use the weapon which membership of a legislative Council would place in their hands to embarrass and damage the Government...I cannot conceive the object of introducing this dangerous principle into the constitution of the proposed Councils. We shall in no way please the class on whose goodwill the submission of India depends: we shall not reconcile our only enemies, but we shall give them arms against ourselves". At the time of the introduction of Lord Cross's Councils Bill into the House of Lords in 1890, Lord Salisbury (Prime Minister of Britain at the time) was still in opposition to the principle of election. He commented on its application to India: "The principle of election or Government by representation is not an Eastern idea; it does not fit Eastern minds", and further, "Do not imagine that you can introduce it in small doses, and that it will be satisfied by that concession".[52]

The Anglo-Indian Press was generally hostile towards the Congress. In January, 1889, the *Calcutta Review* observed: "The Congress then is something more than a Political Club. It is a Revolutionary League....It is obvious that agitation is on foot which may in certain events lead to the most serious consequences to the Government and the country."[53]

The view that the Anglo-Indian Press was merely the mouthpiece of official policy is supported by such articles as "India for the Indians, or India for England?", in which a member of the Civil Service asks: "Is the peace of India to be sacrificed to the ambition of Babudom? Is the stability of the empire to be endangered for a set of Parliamentary Pecksniffs? Are we to forget the triple strife between French, Dutch and English for Hindustan? Is Plassey to go for nothing?"[54] An editorial on the Congress in the *Calcutta Review* called upon all Government servants who are "committed to an open programme of sedition against the power on which....they depend for their daily bread" to first resign their government posts.[55]

The attitude of the Government of India towards the Indian National Congress has been one of steady and increasing hostility. As related above,[56] many persons hold that it was at Lord Dufferin's suggestion that the Indian National Congress as a political organization came into being. But after the first two sessions were over, the demands of the Congress, though extremely moderate in the eyes of the Indians, upset Lord Dufferin. The following extracts from his correspondence with Lord Cross, the Secretary of State for India, would enable anyone to gauge the real attitude of both to the Congress.

1. *Dufferin to Cross, 1 February, 1887.*

"I think on the whole the meeting of the Indian Congress at Calcutta has had an excellent effect, though not exactly in the direction its promoters anticipated. In the first place, it has given us in some degree the intellectual measure of these gentlemen, and has enabled us to gauge their political capacity....My impression is that they are far more able and respectable in their individual capacity than as members of a rather hysterical assembly, in which the more violent and silly of their number rule the roost (rest?). On the other hand, their extravagant pretensions, as embodied in their resolutions, have aroused the opposition and indignation both of the Mahomedan community and of the conservative section of the society, which is both large and influential."

2. *Cross to Dufferin, 25 February, 1887.*

"You have brought up a favourable view of the Indian Congress at Calcutta. This noisy few will no doubt always pass resolutions of the most advanced and at the same time of the most unpractical character. But the masses of the people do not want to be ruled by the Baboos, and it is our duty as well as our interest, and still more the interest of the people, that there is to be English rule."

3. *Dufferin to Cross, 24 September, 1888.*

"A new feature in connexion with the Congress movement has been developed, in the shape of a certain number of Government servants in various provinces acting as agents of the propaganda, and using their official position to collect money on its behalf. Several Provincial Administrations have called our attention to the subject, and have asked for instructions. I am inclined to tell them in reply that they must put a stop to all such proceedings on their own responsibility, but that of course we will support their action in doing so."

4. *Cross to Dufferin, 17 February, 1888.*

"I must, I am afraid, trouble you for your opinion as to these Congresses or Conferences or whatever they call themselves. Will they grow or lessen? What weight is to be attached to their declaration? Is it wise to take any action in any way? I know you have carefully studied the whole question, and that you are quite alive to all its difficulties and dangers."

In reply to the last, Dufferin forwarded to Cross a paper from General Chesney and a letter of Sir Auckland Colvin on the Congress. Chesney's report runs to 19 pages. He states that though men like Sir Madhava Rao and others have joined the Congress, it is really run by a class of extremists. He then adds: "What was in 1885 only an experiment, in 1887 bears the appearance of becoming, as they call it themselves, a prominent national institution....A strong feeling of insecurity inherent in our rule has been shared by some of the ablest Indian administrators: Mountstuart Elphinstone, Lord Metcalfe, Sir Thomas Munro, have given expression to it in vivid terms—a feeling that the people at large may some day combine to make our government impossible, that a movement may arise too widespread to make head against. There is strong evidence, I believe, that the beginnings of such a movement are now to be discerned, a movement directed by the agitators who are 'running' the Congress, which, if not stopped, will produce an outbreak, in which the sympathies of the native army might or might not be enlisted, but the great danger of which would consist in its wide extent. Hitherto, in all our struggles the people of the country, if not on our side, have not been against us. Our wars have been carried on with mercenary armies against mercenary troops, and when the enemy has been conquered in the field, the people in the country have quickly accepted our rule. What difficulties we have encountered hitherto would be nothing to the difficulties that would arise if the people of the whole country, or even any large part of it, were to become actively hostile to our rule. This is the result which the agents who are working the National Congress are trying, whether they mean it or not, to bring about."

In conclusion, Chesney recommends that "further meetings of the Congress should be prohibited."

Sir Auckland Colvin in his letter to Lord Dufferin, dated 10th June, 1888, takes a more moderate view, but deprecates Congress being invited at Government House as it gives them prestige, and advises the Government not to yield to popular demand.

In a memorable speech at St. Andrews Day Dinner, Calcutta, on 30 November, 1888, Lord Dufferin gave expression to his feelings in words which may be quoted *in extenso,* for it may be said without much exaggeration that they represented the settled policy which Britain pursued ever since with remarkable tenacity. Though occasionally forced to yield and make concessions to the strong current of Indian opinion, the principles laid down by Dufferin formed the basic policy of the British Cabinet and the Government of India. Lord Dufferin observed:

"Some intelligent, loyal, patriotic and well-meaning men are desirous of taking, I will not say a further step in advance, but a very big jump into the unknown—by the application to India of democratic methods of government, and the adoption of parliamentary system, which England herself has only reached by slow degrees and through the discipline of many centuries of preparation. The ideal authoritatively suggested, as I understand, is the creation of a representative body or bodies in which the official element shall be in a minority, who shall have what is called the power of the purse, and who, through this instrumentality, shall be able to bring the British executive into subjection to their will. The organization of battalions of native militia and volunteers for the internal and external defence of the country is the next arrangement suggested, and the first practical result to be obtained would be the reduction of the British army to one-half its present numbers. Well, gentlemen, I am afraid that the people of England will not readily be brought to the acceptance of this programme, or to allow such an assembly, or a number of such assemblies, either to interfere with its armies, or to fetter and circumscribe the liberty of action either of the provincial governments or of the Supreme Executive. In the first place, the scheme is eminently unconstitutional; for the essence of constitutional government is that responsibility and power should be committed to the same hands. The idea of irresponsible councils, whose members could arrest the march of Indian legislation, or nullify the policy of the British executive in India, without being liable to be called to account for their acts in a way in which an opposition can be called to account in a constitutional country, must be regarded as an impracticable anomaly. Indeed, so obviously impossible would be the application of any such system in the circumstances of the case, that I do not believe it has been seriously advocated by any native statesman of the slightest weight or importance. . .less than one per cent. has any knowledge of English;. . .it may be said that, out of a population of two hundred million, there are only a very few thousands who may be said to possess adequate qualifications, so far as education and an acquaintance with Western ideas or even Eastern learning are concerned, for taking an intelligent view of those intricate and complicated economic and political questions affecting the destinies of so many millions of men which are almost daily being presented for the consideration of the Government of India. I would ask then, how any reasonable man could imagine that the British Government would be content to allow this microscopic minority to control their administration of that majestic and multiform empire for whose safety and welfare they are responsible in the eyes of God and before the face of civilization?...At present, however, it appears to me a groundless contention that it represents the people of India....I do not wish at all to imply that I view with anything but favour and sympathy the desire of the educated classes of India to be more largely associated with us in the conduct of the affairs of their country. Such an ambition is not only very natural, but very worthy, provided due regard can be had to the circumstances of the country and to the conditions under which the British administration in India discharges its duties."[57]

Three days after he delivered this speech Dufferin sent a copy of it to Cross with a covering letter, a portion of which is quoted below:

Dufferin to Cross, 3 December, 1888.

"Of course you will have been carefully watching the progress of what may be called the Home Rule movement in this country. It is neither formidable, nor—as far as most of the people who take part in it are concerned—either a disloyal or an illegitimate movement, though we must never forget that in it, and connected with it, there is a very real and bitter element of what I call 'bastard' disloyalty, represented by a small Bengalee clique in Calcutta, whose organ is the *Mirror*. I say 'bastard' disloyalty, because, though this party hates Englishmen and the English rule, and desires all it can to injure and discredit them, I do not believe that in their own secret hearts they are aiming at any special ideal as a substitute. It is just possible they may be in communication with Russia, but I do not think they are. At all events, they ought to know that they would find Russia's little finger bigger than our thigh. For all that, we must regard them as our real enemies. On the other hand, the Mahomedans, the Oudh Talookdars, and even most of the responsible and sensible Bengalees, have an instinctive dislike of the Congress and of its works; but midway between the two parties there stands a considerable mass of irresolute opinion which has been watching with wonder the immunity extended to what in its view are the insubordinate proceedings of the Congress-Wallahs, such as Mr. Hume's foolish threats of insurrection, and the dissemination of the libels and calumnies contained in the Tamil Catechism and similar publications. I considered therefore that before I left it would be my duty to give some sign of the light in which I regarded such of the Congress demands and proceedings as are extravagant and reprehensible. Accordingly I took the opportunity of a Scotch dinner at

Calcutta to make the speech which I am sending to you and to the members of your Council."

Dufferin's hostile attitude towards the Congress was further displayed by his efforts to stop all pecuniary help to the Congress.

On 8 October, 1888, he wrote to Cross: "Bye the bye I ought to mention that some months ago the Maharaja of Mysore was said to have contributed largely to the National Congress. Though what really happened did not quite amount to this, I thought it well to send him a verbal message, the purport of which was reduced to writing in the accompanying form. Now the Nizam has sent even a larger contribution to the anti-Congress movement, so I have despatched an intimation to him in the same sense." Dufferin further added that Government servants were collecting money for Congress, but Lieutenant-Governors had been authorised to stop this.

The effect of Lord Dufferin's hostile attitude was almost immediately felt. After the fourth session the Government servants were forbidden to take any part in the proceedings of the Congress. Reference has been made to Colvin's inveterate hostility to the Congress and his correspondence with Hume. "In this exchange it becomes apparent that the difference of opinion between Hume, who had identified himself with the Indian subjects, and Colvin, who represented the British ruling class, was a fundamental one, and one which at this time became more crystallized as the Congress was formulating its demands".[58] Lord Lansdowne took a more liberal view of the Congress. "He said in December, 1890, that the Congress was a legitimate movement which officials could not participate in but which they should not impede. Official recognition of the Congress dates from this statement. Lansdowne is further reported to have referred to the Congress as 'the advanced Liberal Party in India".[59] But Lansdowne was cautious as to the extent to which the reform of the Councils should be carried out, particularly with regard to the expansion of their functions. "In a despatch to Cross (Secretary of State for India) on May 25, 1889, Lansdowne and his Council supported Cross' proposals to allow the Councils the right of interpellation, and added, 'In our opinion the Budget should be submitted to the Legislative Council for discussion and criticism only, and that no power should be given to make a motion regarding it.' Also it was under Lansdowne's administration that in January, 1891, censorship by a government political agent of all newspapers was imposed. Therefore it cannot be maintained that the policy of Lansdowne was basically more favourable to the Congress than that of Dufferin, even though his public utterances were somewhat less vituperative."[60] The next Viceroys and the Secretaries of State continued the traditional hostile policy against the Congress. Lord George Hamilton wrote to Lord Elgin on 11 December, 1896: "It is gratifyng to note that Congress, as a political power, has steadily gone down during the last few years, and this is, I think, largely due to the indifference and unconcern with which the Indian Government has tolerated its proceedings." On 24 June, 1897, Hamilton again wrote to Elgin: "The more I see and hear of the National Congress Party, the more I am impressed with the seditious and double-sided character of the prime-movers of the organization."

Curiously enough, though Hamilton spoke of the decline in the power of the Congress, he was very anxious to curb its influence. On 1st May, 1899, he wrote to Lord Curzon suggesting three measures to counteract Congress activities. These were:

1. To ascertain who, amongst princes and noblemen, subscribed to the Congress fund and to let them know that the Government were aware of the fact.
2. To prefer for honours and distinctions those who were not Congressmen.
3. To exercise a greater control over education, its organisation and text books.

How Lord Curzon followed his chief's instructions may be easily gathered from his activities. There can be hardly any doubt that the Universities Act of 1904 was inspired by the item No. 3, which also accounts for the fact that Curzon forced Lee-Warner's *Citizen of India* as a text-book upon unwilling universities.[61] As to item No. 1, he wrote to Hamilton on 7 June, 1899: "I gather that you want me to ascertain what native princes or noblemen contribute to Congress funds and I will endeavour to discover this."[62] But Curzon hardly required any inspiration. On November 18, 1900, he wrote to Hamilton: "My own belief is that the Congress is tottering to its fall, and one of my greatest ambitions while in India is to assist it to a peaceful demise."

It is interesting to note how Hamilton followed up his general instructions by concrete illustrations. He recommended that Mr. Bhownagree should be included in the Honours list, for "he has fought the violent portion of the Congress with courage and ability and seems to me an able and thoroughly loyal man."[62a] Hamilton also asked Lord Curzon to grant the request of Mrs. Besant as she "had been very useful in Madras in combating the Congress leaders, and denouncing Western methods of agitation as wholly unsuited to India, and endeavouring to establish a system of modern education associated with definite religious and moral training...It seems to me that this college might be a useful antidote, and if so, it would be worth our while to try and smooth down the difficulties which have occurred between the Committee of this college and Sir Anthony Macdonnell."[62b]

In other words, the Government adopted the policy of favouring the anti-Congress elements and putting pressure upon the rich and the aristocracy, who were amenable to Government control, to withdraw their patronage from the Congress. This was done with remarkable success, and few would have dared openly to support the Congress, and thereby provoke the wrath of the British Government. Unfortunately, this unholy conspiracy between the British and Indian authorities against the Congress could not achieve its object, owing to one miscalculation. They did not perceive that the Indian National Congress derived its real strength and support from the middle class and not from the wealthy and the aristocracy.

But Hamilton had other weapons in his armoury to destroy the influence of the Congress. In his letter to Lord Curzon, dated 20 September, 1899, he writes:

"I think the real danger to our rule in India, not now but 50 years hence, is the gradual adoption and extension of Western ideas of agitation and organisation; and, if we could break the educated Hindu party into two sections holding widely different views, we should, by such a division, strengthen our position against the subtle and continuous attack which the spread of education must make upon our present system of Government."

This is the genesis of the policy of "rally the Moderates", which was followed with conspicuous success in the twentieth century, specially by Morley and Montagu, to which reference will be made in the next volume.

It is hardly necessary to add that the British, both at home and in India, were very glad that important communities had not joined the Congress. Lord Cross wrote to Lord Reay, Governor of Bombay, on 23 January, 1890: "It is, however, very satisfactory to find that the Mahomedans and the Parsees have as a body separated from the Congress."

It would appear from what has been said above that the British came to look upon the Congress as a great menace to the security of their Indian Empire. Hence the Indian National Congress became almost a nightmare with the British politicians. It is interesting to note that in some quarters, Dufferin was held mainly responsible for this evil. Lord Hamilton wrote to Lord Curzon on 17 May, 1900:

> "Dufferin ... is a thorough Irishman; and I do not believe he has been in any single place of responsibility and authority in which he did not more or less purchase popularity by leaving to his successors unpleasant legacies. I attribute largely to his mismanagement and want of judgement the origin and development of the Congress Party; and he could, as you say, at that time have effected restrictions in the admission of natives to the higher ranks of the service that at present are quite impossible."[62c]

IV. POLITICAL WORK IN ENGLAND

Reference has been made above to the political propaganda carried on in England, both by liberal Englishmen as well as by Indians, on behalf of India.[63] Hume, who conceived the idea of Indian National Congress, was also "firmly convinced that the British people desired fair play for India, and would see that justice was done, provided only they understood the merits of the case."[64] As soon as the idea of the Congress took a definite shape, Hume proceeded to England and consulted many liberal Englishmen and faithful friends of India, including Lord Ripon, 'as to the best means of getting hearing for Indian political aspirations from the British Parliament and public'. The general consensus of opinion was that "a vigorous and sustained propaganda must be kept up throughout the country (Britain). by means of public meetings, lectures, pamphlets, articles, and correspondence in the press, and by securing the sympathy of local associations and of influential public men". After the Indian National Congress had consolidated public opinion in India, Hume was more and more convinced that the future political work lay more in Britain than in India.

He pointed out that 'the European officials in India must necessarily be antagonistic to the Congress programme whose tendency was to curtail the virtually autocratic powers exercised by them, and as they are all-powerful, it is not possible to secure any reforms'. "Our only hope lies in awakening the British public to a sense of the wrongs" of the Indian people.[65] As Wedderburn put it, "a frontal attack on bureaucratic power, firmly entrenched at Simla—with all the armoury of repression at its command—was hopeless. But success was within reach, by means of a flanking movement, that is, by an appeal to the British elector."[66] Inspired by this idea Hume, in a letter dated 10 February, 1889, pressed upon Congress workers the vital need of carrying on a full-fledged political propaganda in Britain. "The least that we could do," said he, "would be to provide ample funds—for sending and keeping constantly in England deputations of our ablest speakers to plead their country's cause—to enable our British Committee to keep up an unbroken series of public meetings, whereat the true state of affairs in India might be expounded—to flood Great Britain with pamphlets, leaflets, newspapers, and magazine articles—in a word to carry on agitation there, on the lines and scale of that in virtue of which the Anti-Corn-Law League triumphed".[67]

In accordance with this scheme, a paid Agency was established in 1888 under William Digby with a regular office, and a vigorous campaign was carried on in Great Britain. "Then thousand copies of the Report of the third Congress, and many thousand copies of speeches and pamphlets were printed and circulated, while Messrs. W. C. Bonnerjee and Eardley Norton, in connection with the Agency, addressed a number of public meetings, and Mr. Bradlaugh delivered many lectures on Indian questions in different parts of England." A permanent committee, under the title (finally adopted) of "The British Committee of the Indian National Congress", was started in July, 1889, with Sir W. Wedderburn as Chairman, Mr. Digby as Secretary, and a number of distinguished Englishmen and two Indians (W. C. Bonnerjee and Dadabhai Naoroji) as members. The Indian National Congress of 1889 confirmed its constitution and voted Rs. 45,000 for its maintenance, the amount to be raised by a proportional contribution from each of the Provincial Congress Committees.[68]

The Committee decided to wage war against the hostile official propaganda, particularly of the India Office, on three fronts; in Parliament, by organizing an Indian Parliamentary Committee; on the platform, by arranging public meetings throughout the country; and in the Press, by founding the journal *"India"* as an organ of Congress views.

The Indian Parliamentary Committee gained great strength in 1893 when it comprised 154 members of the House of Commons. Their activities led to the appointment of the "Welby Royal Commission on Indian expenditure and the apportionment of charge between India and the United Kingdom." It is also probably due to their efforts that the House of Commons adopted in 1893 a resolution in favour of holding simultaneous examinations for the I.C.S.[68a]

A number of public meetings and lectures were addressed, not only by liberal Englishmen but also by eminent Indians like Surendranath Banerji and G. K. Gokhale. Gokhale made a very good impression by his political speeches at Manchester and other places. He spoke at a meeting of the Undergraduates' Union at Cambridge, where "his motion in favour of more popular institutions for India was carried by 161 to 62." In addition to public meetings and lectures, the interest in India was kept alive through addresses to associations and other select audiences, social entertainments, and interviews with ministers, members of Parliament, editors, and other public men.[69]

The main function of the journal, *India*, was to supply reliable information to the British public about the actual state of affairs in India, in order to counteract the influence of the London Press whose articles on Indian subjects were "mainly supplied by Anglo-Indians unfavourable to Indian aspirations." The *India* supplied true record of "current facts, events and opinions" in India and thus furnished "arms and materials to those who were willing to fight for the cause of India". Its circulation was not very large, but it was recognized as "the chief purveyor of Indian news to a large part of the Liberal Press".

It may be noted in conclusion that political propaganda by the Indians was also carried on in Europe outside Britain. To cite an example, the veteran Indian politician Dadabhai Naoroji placed the Indian question before international opinion at the Congress of Socialists at Amsterdam, on 17 August, 1904. The following summary account is taken from the *Temps* of 19 August, 1904:—

> "At to-day's sitting a speech has been delivered which has caused a profound sensation and has marked, at the same time, the entry into the International party of Socialists of a representative of the Indian race.
>
> "This delegate is called Dadabhai Naoroji. He is an old man. He has been fighting for fifty years for the amelioration of the lot of his countrymen.
>
> "He recalled that the Indian Empire has been founded by the English solely by the co-operation of the Indians, who fought for them and paid for their wars. To recompense the Indians, the English have subjected them to an execrable rule. A permanent drain impoverishes India. Two hundred millions of rupees are paid every year by the country to the officials who are Englishmen. One hundred million alone remains in the country. On the other hand, every year commerce takes out of India two hundred millions of rupees. It is an impoverishment of 300 millions of rupees or 480 million francs... This accounts for the frightful misery amongst the people. When the harvest is good a large portion of the people have scarcely the wherewithal to appease their hunger. When the harvest fails, there is famine and millions die of starvation. It is not that the produce is

insufficient for the requirements of the country, but it is too poor to buy back the produce of its labour. Huge exportations of rice and grain have taken place at a time when the cultivators were dying in inanition.

"In 1833 and in 1858 England by solemn pledges undertook to treat the indigenes as its own subjects. She has conferred all the public offices on her own people. She has oppressed and ground down the Indians; she has broken her pledged word. Her conduct ought to be branded."

After this discourse the president had recorded that: "This Congress unanimously stigmatises the Colonial policy of England."[70]

V. THE RELATION OF THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS WITH THE OLD POLITICAL ASSOCIATIONS

It would be interesting to study the relations between the Indian National Congress and the political associations already existing in India, which continued to carry on their useful activities after the foundation of the Congress. Copious data are available for such a study so far as the British Indian Association of Calcutta is concerned. The early history and activities of this body, founded as far back as 1851, have been described above.[71] It sent delegates to the Congress for the first three years (1885-87), but then difference arose over the exact nature and function of the Indian National Congress.

"In reply to a letter from the Standing Committee of the Congress (Calcutta), seeking the views of the British Indian Association on the tentative rules drawn up for the Congress, the Secretary of the British Indian Association stated (6th December, 1888) that while the Association had co-operated with the Congress for the past three years and would do so in future, it definitely objected to the tentative rules, which aimed at changing the character of the Congress and making it a separate and permanent organisation. The British Indian Association considered the Congress as only a national conference, representing the different political bodies in the country but not being a permanent and independent entity. The letter continued that the objects of the Congress did not differ materially from those of the existing political associations, namely, to petition the authorities on redress of grievances. But it would lose its representative character if it turned itself into a separate independent body, since the existing political associations would not like to function as mere Sub-Committees of the Congress. The letter concluded: 'The Committee are clearly of opinion that the Congress should simply be a conference of the representatives of the nation and nothing more, and with that view it should dissolve itself as soon as its sitting was over, leaving to the different political Associations of the country to carry out the objects of the conference in the way which was most agreeable to them. In this way unification of public opinion will be secured while independence of the actions of the different Associations will be recognised and respected".[72]

As the Congress refused to accept this point of view, the British Indian Association *practically* held aloof from it, for it instructed its delegates "not to take part in the discussion of any subject matter other than those relating to the expansion of the Legislative Council and the extension of the Permanent Settlement. The delegates were also forbidden to represent any other institution at the Congress".[73]

The rift between the two political organizations, though unfortunate, was inevitable. "It was not because the Association represented the rich and the Congress the poor, or because the Association's policy was timid while that of the Congress was bold. In the early days of the Congress there was not much of a difference between the two bodies in respect of either composition or policy. The rift was inevitable because of the natural pride of a political organisation of 40 years' standing, refusing to be swallowed up by an organisation just born".[74]

It should be noted that the British Indian Association did not altogether lose its prestige and importance as a political organization down to the end of the nineteenth century. As noted above, "when at the end of 1895 Gandhi came to India to ventilate the grievances of Indians in South Africa, he sought the help of the British Indian Association (November, 1895) to make necessary representations to the British and Indian Governments".[75] The British Indian Association "fully supported the views of Gandhi and sent a strong representation on the subject to the Government of India on the 5th February, 1897."[76]

Most of the other political associations, however, recognized the Indian National Congress as the central political organization representing India as a whole, and regarded themselves as more or less feeder institutions, concentrating their attention upon, and confining their activities to, the political regeneration of the particular provinces to which they belonged. In Bengal, and later in other provinces, the Annual Provincial Conference, and later even District Conference, became a regular feature of political activities. These bodies served as electoral colleges for the selection of delegates to the annual session of the Congress. They also formulated the political views to be placed before the Congress, and were mainly instrumental in giving publicity to the proceedings of the Congress and carrying its resolutions into effect.[77] A properly articulated system was thus evolved with the Indian National Congress as its apex, and the local organizations (at the district or even lower level) as the broad base. By the beginning of the twentieth century the Indian National Congress had become the premier political organization of the country, casting into shade all the other political organizations in India.

In spite of its position as the premier political organization in India, the Indian National Congress suffered from some serious drawbacks which were noted by eminent Indians almost from the very beginning. Bankim-chandra Chatterji criticised its lack of contact with the masses which, in his opinion, was essential for a political organization if it wanted to do any effective work. He also ridiculed its mentality of a mendicant or beggar. Some younger members also felt keenly on the subject, and regretted the lack of all political activity on the part of the Congress exept for the three days during which it was in session every year. Aswini-kumar Datta of Barisal (then a district in Bengal), who was destined to achieve great fame during the hectic days of the *Swadeshi* movement in Bengal, voiced this feeling in the session of the Congress held at Amraoti in 1897, when he denounced it as a "three days' *tāmāshā* (fun)". He was fully entitled to make this remark, for in the course of that year he had managed to send a petition signed by forty thousand common men, including peasants, weavers, carpenters, small traders etc., to the British Parliament urging the early introduction of the representative system of government in India.[78]

These defects were partially removed by the Provincial Conferences which developed into a powerful political organization in Bengal. This was mainly due to the activity of the Indian Association, which was carried throughout the year with a network of branch associations spread all over the province. Thus the old political organizations, wherever they were still active, supplemented the work of the Indian National Congress. Nevertheless, it must be admittted that it remained in 1905, as it was in 1885, an organization of the English-educated middle class, and had no right to claim a popular character.

---

1. *Hist. Congr.*, p. 11.
2. See p. 512.
3. P. 1 ff.
4. P. 2.
5. *A Nation in Making*, p. 99.

5a. Professor Sundar Raman, who attended the first session of the Indian National Congress, also refers to the meeting mentioned by Mrs. Besant. According to him "Diwan Bahadur Raghunath Rao got up a special meeting of his friends 'to find ways and means of bringing together Indian politicians to inaugurate a political movement' ..." (Andrews and Mookerjee, p. 124).

5b. Besant, p. 3.

5c. Ibid.

6. *A Nation in Making*, p. 98.

7. A. C. Mazumdar, 40.

8. Andrews and Mookerjee, 116.

9. Ibid, 121-2.

10. Hume, 50.

11. Ibid, 79.

12. Ibid, 80-1. Wedderburn corroborates the reality of such danger by his personal experience of Deccan riots. Cf. Vol. IX, p. 940.

13. For the extracts from this letter quoted below, cf. Hume, 50-53.

14. Hume, 59-60.

15. Introduction to *Indian Politics* (published by G. A. Natesan, Madras, 1898). *Indian National Congress* (Natesan)—Page A at the end.

16. Andrews and Mookerjee, 122-4.

17. *IHQ*, XXXI, 150.

18. Hume, 101.

19. Ibid, 77.

20. Ibid, 63-4; Andrews and Mookerjee, 121.

21. Andrews and Mookerjee, 124.

22. B.C. Pal-I, II. 13-4.

22a. For a full discussion of this question cf. R. C. Majumdar, *Glimpses of Bengal in the Nineteenth Century*, pp. 91 ff.

23. For Dr. Chatterji's views cf. *Journal of Indian History* XXXVI, 172; also *Modern Review*, October, 1950, p. 273.

24. Hume, 53.

25. The accounts of the Congress sessions that follow, unless otherwise stated, are based on the published proceedings of the different sessions of the Indian National Congress.

26. *Congress*, xviii.

27. This resolution has been quoted in Vol. IX, p. 762.

28. Appendix to the *Proceedings of the First session of the Congress*, pp. 78-82.

29. This is the figure mentioned by Badruddin Tyabji in his Presidential Address at the Madras session and supported by Mrs. Besant (p. 15). But A. C. Mazumdar (p. 67) and Andrews and Mookerjee (p. 143) put the number respectively, at 406 and 412.

30. B. C. Pal observes (op. cit. 14): "After the Congress of Bombay, Mr. Hume came to Calcutta to organise the next session of the Congress that was to be held there. And he soon discovered the impossibility of enlisting the sympathies and active co-operation of politically-minded and educated Bengal if Surendra Nath was left out of the counsels of the Congress. He, therefore, called upon Surendra Nath and induced him to join the Congress." See above, pp. 514, 533.

30a. Besant, 15.

30b. Ibid.

30c. *On the Present State of Indian Politics*, pp. 11-2.

30d. *The Indian Mutiny of 1857*, p. 412.

31. B. C. Pal-I, II. 35-41.

32. Hume, 61-2.

33. Ibid.

34. *Congress Proceedings*, 1886-91; A. C. Mazumdar, 72.

35. For details, cf. Hume, 64 ff.

36. Ibid, 67.

37. B. C. Pal-I, II. 48-52.

38. For the text of the speech, cf. *Lord Dufferin's Speeches delivered in India*, pp. 237-44. It has been referred to above, and will be more fully discussed later.

39. This view gains some support from the following passage in his letter to Lord Cross, Secretary of State for India, dated 3 December, 1888, forwarding a copy of his speech: "It will of course make the Home Rule party in India very angry and expose me to a good deal of obloquy and abuse just as I am leaving the country, the echoes of which may reverberate at home, but I thought it would clear the atmosphere and render Lansdowne's position easier and pleasanter". H. P. Ghose, a veteran old Congressman in Calcutta, told me that he found some notes in the handwriting of an eminent Englishman of the time, in a

printed book belonging to him, from which it appears that Lord Dufferin poured his vial of wrath upon the Congress as the political leaders refused to make a demonstration on his departure as they did on the occasion of Lord Ripon's leaving India. I have seen the notes.

40. See p. 312.
41. See p. 390.
42. The amendment of Munshi Hidayat Rasul, a delegate from Awadh, was rejected by the Muhammadan delegates; 16 voted for and 23 against the proposal, while the great bulk did not vote at all.
43. For Englishmen's hatred and aversion towards the Bengalis, see pp. 337-8, 373-5.
44. Cf. Vol. IX, pp. 762-3, 767.
45. Ibid, pp. 787 ff.
46. Ibid, 789 ff.
47. Appendix to the *Proceedings of the First session of the Congress*, pp. 80-82. The italics are mine.
48. 1885, pp. 6-7.
49. See p. 397.
50. *IHQ*, XXXI, 140.
51. Ibid, 140-41.
52. Ibid, 141-42.
53. *Calcutta Review*, 1889, p. 142.
54. Ibid, 1890, pp. 34-5.
55. Ibid, 1889, p. 144.
56. See p. 530.
57. *IHQ*, XXXI, 149-50.
58. Ibid, 145.
59. Ibid.
60. *IHQ*, XXXI, 145-6.
61. Chintamani, 32.
62. *Calcutta Review*, 1954, p. 40.

62a. Hamilton to Elgin, 27 May, 1897.

62b. Hamilton to Curzon, 9 August, 1899.

62c. The letters referred to in this section are mostly unpublished and have been copied from the CRO Library by Dr. A. K. Majumdar. They have since been published in the *Advent of Independence*, by Dr. A. K. Majumdar (Appendix V).

63. Cf. pp. 518-21.
64. Hume, 54.
65. Ibid, 85-6.
66. Ibid, 86.
67. Ibid.
68. Ibid, 87-8.

68a. Cf. Vol. IX, p. 790.

69. Hume, 99.
70. *Modern Review*, III. 527.
71. See pp. 448-54.
72. *Report of the Regional Records Survey Committee for West Bengal* (1957-8), pp. 42-3.
73. Ibid, 43.
74. Ibid.
75. Ibid, 43-4.
76. Ibid, 44.
77. For an account of the Bengal Provincial Conference, cf. *Bengal Renaissance*, pp. 169-71.
78. Ibid, 170.

CHAPTER XVI (LIV)

THE NATIONALIST MOVEMENT IN POLITICS

I. RISE OF THE NATIONALIST PARTY

The foundation of the Indian National Congress marks a turning point in the history of Modern India. It shortly developed into a powerful political organization of all-India character and a public forum of the politically advanced section of the people. It could legitimately claim to represent the Indian intelligentsia. It focussed the political ideas of English-educated Indians and gave them a definite shape and form. Compared with the vast population of India the class represented by the Congress was no doubt numerically very poor, and Lord Dufferin, the Viceroy of India, did not commit any arithmetical error when he described, rather derided, it as a 'microscopic minority' of the Indian people. But such a minority always constitutes the brain of the people and has been regarded as their rightful representative even in progressive countries of the West. Lord Dufferin might well have remembered that about the time when he was born, the House of Commons represented a very small minority of the people.

The Indian National Congress was founded on the twin rocks of unswerving loyalty to the British sovereign and indissoluble partnership of the British Empire. It was pledged to strictly constitutional mode of agitation, which practically meant humble prayers and petitions to the Government, both in India and England, and occasional appeals to the English people who theoretically constituted the fountain source of all authority. These bore very little fruit, but were not altogether useless, for the Indian Councils Act of 1892 may justly be looked upon as an achievement of the Indian National Congress. Whatever might have been the intrinsic merit of the Act as a measure of political advancement, it certainly paved the way for further reforms of a more substantial character.

But although the Indian National Congress failed to secure from an unsympathetic Government any substantial grant of political reforms which it demanded for twenty years (1885-1905), it helped the political advancement of India in various ways. The annual sessions of the Congress, by bringing together the leading representative men from widely remote parts of India, gave a reality to the ideal of Indian unity, developed patriotic feelings among all classes and the diverse races and creeds of India, and awakened political consciousness among a steadily increasing circle of educated Indians. Besides, as the more important political, economic and administrative problems of India were regularly discussed in the meetings of the Congress, and later also in the Provincial Conferences, and these discussions often reached a very high level, the Indian National Congress became instrumental in widely diffusing very useful and accurate knowledge necessary for the political development of India, and educating public opinion on all questions concerning the welfare and progress of India.

The same object was further achieved by the part played by some of the Congress leaders in the enlarged Legislative Councils set up by the Act of 1892. A large number of very distinguished political leaders were elected members of these councils, and for the first time Indian point of view on every public question was most ably pleaded by them. The eloquent speeches of Pherozeshah Mehta and Surendra-nath Banerji, voicing the aims and aspirations of political India, which were hitherto heard only in the Congress *pandal* or on public platform, were now echoed in the Council Chamber in the presence of the highest officials of the Government. Men like Gopal Krishna Gokhale, Ashu-tosh Mukherji, Rash-behari Ghosh, R. M. Sayani, P. A. Charlu, B. K. Bose, Sayyid Husain Bilgrami, and many others[1] brought to bear upon the burning questions of the day such a mature knowledge and wealth of details that no Government could easily brush them aside. They achieved little success by way of practical results, but their activities as well as the career of Dadabhai Naoroji, who placed the Indian question before the British public, and before the House of Commons when he was elected its member in 1892, roused the political consciousness of India to an extent unknown before.

Apart from this notable contribution to the political training of the Indian people, the Indian National Congress enhanced the political prestige of India and quickened our sense of national pride, in an indirect way, through the personality, character, patriotism, and high intellectual brilliance of the great galaxy of eminent leaders who nurtured this infant institution and brought it safely to an adolescent stage. Men like Dadabhai Naoroji, Surendra-nath Banerji, Pherozeshah Mehta, R. C. Dutt, Lal-mohan Ghosh, G. K. Gokhale, B. G. Tilak and Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya,—to mention only a few—made a deep impression not only upon all classes and shades of opinion in India, but even upon Englishmen, as they were visible embodiments of the intellectual and cultural progress that India had made in the nineteenth century. Their lives and attainments were living testimony to the fitness of Indians for advanced political life, and they raised the Indians in the estimation of our foreign rulers such as nothing else could possibly have done.

It would be unjust therefore to minimise the importance of the Indian National Congress or the value of its work, even though its actual attainments fell far short of its aims and aspirations. It would, however, be equally wrong to look upon the Congress as the only channel through which flowed the political currents of India, and to regard it as the sole medium of the evolution of national life or the only agency which carried on the campaign for political regeneration of India during the period from 1885 to 1905.

Broadly speaking, the practical measures of reform demanded by the Indian National Congress between 1885 and 1905 represent more or less the stage of political progress reached in Bengal during the preceding quarter of a century. The shortcomings of the British rule and the measures suggested for their removal cover nearly the same ground. The means to achieve the ends were also the same. One marks the same unflinching faith in the providential character of the British rule, the robust and sincere sentiments of devoted loyalty to the British crown, and the same pathetic, almost abject, belief in the sense of justice of the British people who would concede all the reasonable demands of the Indians as soon as they were properly approached. The Indian National Congress, however, could not keep pace with the advanced political ideals, and failed to respond to the developed sense of nationality and patriotism, which grew in the last quarter of the nineteenth century. An abstract love of liberty for its own sake and as our birth-right, a passionate desire for freedom based upon a sense of greatness of our ancient culture, an innate hatred of British rule on account of its iniquitous character, and a spirited protest against the arrogance of the English—all these which deeply stirred the neo-nationalists of the period, are conspicuous by their absence in the programme and proceedings of the Indian National Congress during the first twenty years of its existence. No wonder, therefore, that the ideals and methods of the Congress failed to satisfy the advanced political thinkers of the time and the votaries of the new spirit of nationalism who were gradually becoming a political force in the country.

There were mutterings of protests against the Congress here and there,[2] and Arabinda Ghosh, destined to attain immortal fame at a later date, published a series of diatribes against it in the years 1893-4 in the *Indu Prakash* of Bombay. The general tone of the criticism may be judged by the following passages:

"The Congress in Bengal is dying of consumption; annually its proportions sink into greater insignificance; its leaders, the Bonnerjis and Bannerjis and Lalmohan Ghoses, have climbed into the rarefied atmosphere of the Legislative Council and lost all hold on the imagination of the young men. The desire for a nobler and more inspiring patriotism is growing more intense. This is an omen of good hope for the future; for what Bengal thinks tomorrow, India will be thinking tomorrow week"[3].

About a year earlier he had written:

"I say, of the Congress, then, this,—that its aims are mistaken, that the spirit in which it proceeds towards their accomplishment is not a spirit of sincerity and whole-heartedness, and that the methods it has chosen are not the right methods, and the leaders in whom it trusts, not the right sort of men to be leaders;—in brief, that we are at present the blind led, if not by the blind, at any rate by the one-eyed....In an era when democracy and similar big words slide so glibly from our tongues, a body like the Congress, which represents not the mass of the population, but a single and very limited class, could not honestly be called national...."

Arabinda then refers to the contrary views of Pherozeshah Mehta and Manmohan Ghosh both of whom regarded the Congress as national. According to Mehta, "it is because the masses are still unable to articulate definite political demands that the functions and duty devolve upon their educated and enlightened compatriots to feel, to understand and to interpret their grievances and requirements, and to suggest and indicate how these can best be redressed and met". "The Congress", says Manmohan Ghosh, "represents the thinking portion of the Indian people, whose duty it is to guide the ignorant, and this in his opinion sufficiently justifies the Congress in calling itself national". Arabinda concludes. "I shall therefore amend the obnoxious phrase and declare that the National Congress may be as national as you please, but it is not a popular body and has not in any way attempted to become a popular body".[4]

An edge was lent to the criticism against the Congress by the obvious fact that it did not respond to the famous manifesto issued by Allan Octavian Hume to the graduates of the Calcutta University in March, 1883, which is generally believed to have led to its inauguration two years later. Attention may be drawn to a few passages of this manifesto: 1. "Whether in the individual or the nation, all vital progress must spring from within." 2. "They who would be free themselves must strike the blow." 3. "Whether in the case of individuals or nations, self-sacrifice and unselfishness are the only unfailing guides to freedom and happiness." These are noble sentiments but found no echo in the hearts of the leaders of the Congress if they are judged by their speeches and activities during the first twenty years. Instead of putting faith in the maxim that all vital progress must spring from within, the Congress looked to the British Government for all improvements. Hume, in his manifesto, appealed to the educated Indians to "make a resolute struggle to secure freedom for yourselves and your country", and observed that if "fifty men cannot be found with sufficient power of self-sacrifice, sufficient love for and pride in their country, sufficient genuine and unselfish heartfelt patriotism to take the initiative, and if needs be, devote the rest of their lives to the cause, then there is no hope for India". It would be hardly an exaggeration to say that the Congress would have looked upon this programme almost with horror and would not touch it with a pair of thongs.

The new nationalists felt whole-hearted sympathy with the ideals preached by Hume but ignored so far by the Congress. Their criticism against the Congress has been ably summed up by Lajpat Rai, himself a distinguished nationalist leader[5]. Their main point of attack was that the Congress lacked the essentials of a national movement. "The Congress movement", observed Lajpat Rai, "was neither inspired by the people, nor devised or planned by them. It was a movement not from within". 'The Congress leaders had neither sufficient political consciousness nor faith. They had certain political opinions, but not beliefs for which they were willing to suffer. Nor were they prepared to bear persecution for the cause they undertook. Either they did not know that they had a cause, or they were wanting in that earnestness which makes men suffer for a cause.'

Whether these comments and criticisms were fully justified or not, they unerringly indicate the new political outlook of the nationalist school as distinguished from those who had hitherto led the activities of the Congress. But their most serious charge against the Congress was that "its leaders were not in touch with the people; they felt shy of the masses, made no efforts to reach them, and systematically discouraged younger men from doing the same". There is no doubt that this charge was fair and just. In this respect Hume and some other English friends of the Congress movement showed more earnestness than many of the Indian leaders. When the prayers and petitions to the Government produced no effect, Hume concluded that "in order to *constrain the Government* to move, the leaders of the Indian people must adopt measures of exceptional vigour, following the drastic methods pursued in England by Bright and Cobden in their great campaign on behalf of the people's food." Hume decided that the next step was "to instruct the great English nation and also the far greater nation of India, so that every Indian shall become a comrade and if need be our soldier in the great war that we will wage for justice, for our liberties and our right".[6] Hume is said to have worked with his wonted energy, distributing tracts, leaflets and pamphlets, sending out lecturers and calling meetings both in large towns and in country districts. Over one thousand meetings were held and over half a million pamphlets were distributed. If this work had been continued, the history of the Congress would have been different. The movement in England failed for funds; the movement in India collapsed for want of vigour.

It is thus apparent that although the organization envisaged by Hume might have developed into a truly national movement, the leaders of the Indian National Congress proved unequal to the task. Their activities in and outside the Congress and the Legislative Councils, however useful and praiseworthy in other ways, did not advance the cause of the national movement, whose origin and nature have been described above.

This, however, did not in any way deflect the national movement from its course, or retard its further development. As a matter of fact, the Indian National Congress lost the leadership of the national movement shortly after its birth, and did not recapture it until Mahatma Gandhi came to preside over its destiny. During this long interval the real national movement ran its course outside the Congress *pandal* and the legislative chambers. The same factors which gave birth to it and sustained it so far, were not only still at work, but, as mentioned above, some of them grew more and more intense with the progress of time, and gave a new shape and form to Indian nationalism.

This newly developed nationalism began to exercise considerable influence upon Indian politics towards the close of the nineteenth century. Those who were imbued with this new spirit gradually drifted apart from the policy and ideals of the Congress, and formed a new group, first inside and then outside it. This process was fully in evidence before 1905, the closing year of this volume, but had not run its full course, nor fully developed its philosophical background, till two or three years later. It would be convenient, however, to discuss its main characteristics and fundamental principles at this formative stage so that the events at the opening of the next period may be studied in their true perspective.

The high priest of this new nationalism was Arabinda Ghosh whose criticism of the Congress has been quoted above. The following extract from one of his articles in his organ, the *Bande Mataram*, gives an insight into his philosophical interpretation of nationalism:

"It is not in human nature to rest eternally contented with a state of subordination or serfdom. God made man in his own image, essentially and potentially free and pure; shall man keep him in eternal bondage and sin? Freedom is constitutional in man, and when this freedom is curtailed by social and civil laws and institutions, it is done not to kill but to perfect this very freedom itself. This is the only rational end and justification of those necessary limitations that society imposes upon human freedom everywhere, and where this justification is absent, human nature revolts against these limitations, whether social, religious, or political, creating conflicts, struggles, revolutions, through which humanity realises its divinely appointed destiny everywhere. The desire for autonomy is constitutional in man and not a mere functional disturbance such as the tyrant and the aggressor has always proclaimed it to be. Is it sinful to cherish that which is a necessary element in the very constitution of man's mind and soul? Has not history preserved, as the most sacred relics of the race, the achievements of this natural and God-inspired impulse from its very birth? Has not art beautified it in a thousand lovely forms, in poetry, in painting, in music, and in sculpture? Has not religion, wherever and whenever it has not been able to free itself from the selfish control of priests and princes, sanctified this noble instinct, as the very breath of God? Shall we alone deem it a sin and be branded, for cherishing this divine desire, as criminals?

"Tyrants have tried but have they ever succeeded in repressing this natural love of freedom in man? Repressed it has grown in strength; crushed under the heel of the tyrant, it has assumed a myriad forms and in successive incarnations gaining strength and inspiration from repeated failures and endless suffering, it has risen finally, to overthrow its oppressor for good: this is the teaching of History, this is the message of Humanity.

"But like the scriptural adder, tyrants have eyes but they see not, have ears but they hear not, and the universal teaching of history, and the eternal message of humanity, are both lost on them. And the car of progress has, through human folly and perversity, to wade through blood and ruin still on earth."[7]

This is the rationale of the struggle for independence which was the keynote of the new school.

The credit of leavening Indian politics with this national spirit undoubtedly goes to Tilak. Bāl Gangādhar Tilak, a Chitpāvan Brahman of Poona, was the first among the Indian political leaders to emphasize, both by precept and example, the four distinctive features which characterized the new movement. The first is a sincere faith in the glory and greatness of Indian culture in the past and the belief that all future development must be based upon this stable foundation. The second is a heartfelt conviction that the policy of mendicancy followed by the Congress would not lead to the desired goal, and that the Indians must rely on their own strength and assert their inalienable rights, even at the risk of great sufferings and sacrifices, before they can hope to achieve any substantial measure of self-government. The third is the clear enunciation that the political goal of India is self-government or *Swarāj* rather than reforms in administration to which the Congress devoted its whole energy and attention during the early years of its existence. The fourth is the awakening of political consciousness among the people at large and the consequent need of political agitation among the masses.

Tilak struck a new note in Indian politics when a terrible famine broke out in Bombay in 1896. His emissaries orally explained to the people the 'relevant sections of the Famine Relief Code and distributed leaflets or pamphlets containing abstracts of its important sections. Having thus educated the people in the knowledge of their rights, Tilak asked the people to take their stand on their rights and boldly demand the benefits offered by the Famine Relief Code. He asked them not to be cowards and not to pay the Government dues by selling their lands and cattle.' Through his paper, the *Kesari*, he made stirring appeals to the people. "When the Queen desires that none should die, when the Governor declares that all should live,...will you", he passionately exclaimed, "kill yourself by timidity and starvation? If you have money to pay Government dues, pay them by all means. But if you have not, will you sell your things away only to avoid the supposed wrath of subordinate Government officers? Can you not be bold, even when in the grip of death?"[7a] Week after week Tilak continued in this strain, denouncing in forceful language the lack of manliness among the "sheepish people", and urging upon them lessons of self-reliance. He deplored and condemned food riots. "Why loot the *bazars*", he used to say, "go to the Collector and tell him to give you work and food. That is his duty". It is this activity of Tilak which the official circles regarded as "no-rent campaign" and has been described by them as such ever since. Tilak's name was entered into the "Black List" of the Government as 'Enemy Number One'. The official circles never forgot or forgave him, and he was looked upon as one of those tall poppies which must be cut off to make India safe for British bureaucracy.

Far more important was the inauguration of the Ganapati and Shivaji festivals by Tilak which may be said to be an important landmark in the history of the new movement. Tilak's object undoubtedly was to utilize the religious instincts and historical traditions for the purpose of engendering patriotism and national spirit among the people. He also hoped that these festivals, organized on a popular basis, would bring together the masses and the classes, a much desired contact, the importance of which the Congress never realized.

The Gaṇapati festival was an old religious institution in Maharashtra, but Tilak transformed it into a national festival and gave it a political character by organizing lectures, processions, *melās,* and singing parties. These were calculated to inculcate in the people a sturdy manhood, organized discipline and love of their country. Besides, it offered a common platform to the masses and classes and helped considerably in fostering national sentiment and promoting political education among large sections of people who kept aloof from organizations of a distinctive political character such as the Congress or Conferences. The festival, as reorganized by Tilak in 1893, appealed instinctively to all classes of people and spread rapidly all over Maharashtra.

Two classes of people were, however, seriously opposed to it. The liberal Hindus of the school of Ranade sneered at the old orthodox beliefs and practices underlying the ceremony, and the orthodox Congress politicians condemned it as an aggressive challenge against Muslims. Tilak defended his position in several articles in the *Kesari* in 1896. He emphasized the "wisdom of the policy of carrying forward, *mutatis mutandis,* those institutions which had been honoured by time and saved from the eternal silence." He also quoted analogies from the history of Greece and Rome. "The great unifying and rousing effect of the Olympian and Pythian festivals, and also of the Circus was emphasized with convincing force". Such festivals, he said, provided great opportunities for the educated classes to come into close contact with the illiterate masses, to enter into their very spirit, to understand their needs and grievances, and lastly, to make them co-sharers in the benefits of education and all other new notions of patriotism which education usually carried with it. To social reformers, he replied with bitter sarcasm: "Ranade, mixing with the people in the Ganesh festival and lecturing to them in front of that God of learning, or participating freely in the anniversary celebrations of a saint like Ramdas and expatiating before hundreds of people that gathered there on the national work of that mighty and heroic sage, would be inconceivably more useful to the nation than Ranade sitting in the prayer-hall of the social reformers with his eyes and lips closed in devoted contemplation of their idea of the Almighty".[8]

Tilak met the objections of the politicians by stating that "there was nothing wrong in providing a platform for all the Hindus of all high and low classes to stand together and discharge a joint national duty." On this occasion, as in later days, Tilak was charged with having a communal outlook and even accused of malice and hatred against the Muslims. But all this is belied, among others, by his magnanimous gesture at the Lakhnau Congress to which reference will be made later. Incidentally, reference may be made in this connection to another charge levelled against Tilak, namely, that he started an organization known as the Anti-Cow-Killing Society, which was intended to be, and actually served as, a direct provocation to the Muslims. This allegation was repeated in Valentine Chirol's book, *Indian Unrest,* and formed one of the counts in the libel case instituted by Tilak against him. Chirol requested the Government of India to supply him evidence in justification of this and other accusations he had made against Tilak, for they were based on official records. The Government of India appointed Mr. Montgomery, I.C.S., as a special officer for this purpose. After sifting all the available records, Montgomery was forced to come to the conclusion that "Tilak had nothing to do with the inception of an anti-cow-killing movement, nor is there any evidence to show that either before or after the Hindu-Muslim riots of 1893 he took any part in the management of the Anti-Cow-Killing Society or in furthering its aims".[9] It is worth mentioning in this connection that even the Ali brothers acknowledged Tilak as their political *guru.*

The origin of the Shivaji festival is to be traced to the dilapidated condition of the tomb of Shivaji at Raigarh, which was his capital. In an issue of the *Kesari* in April, 1895, Tilak referred to it and made an appeal for money to repair the monument out of gratitude to Shivaji, the liberator of Maharashtra and protector of Hinduism. This object was not achieved during the lifetime of Tilak, but there were two important side issues of highly important character. The first was a movement, mainly through Tilak's efforts, to celebrate an annual festival at Raigarh in honour of Shivaji's birth. In spite of official opposition, the first celebration was successfully held on 15 March, 1895, at Raigarh, and lasted for two or three days amid the greatest enthusiasm of the people. Indeed, the festival took such a great hold over the public mind that it was held at many other places besides Raigarh.

These celebrations led to another important development, namely, a revision of the historical estimate of Shivaji. The idea gradually gained ground that Shivaji should be judged by the standard of morality applicable to a great public benefactor; he had on his shoulders the responsibility of establishing *Swarāj* for the Marathas, and whatever he did, with the purpose of accomplishing this end, was done for national good and must, therefore, be deemed to be appropriate.

The Shivaji festival was "national hero-worship, and round his name rallied all the newly aroused national pride and enthusiasm of the Maharashtrian people". As regards the new conceptions of Shivaji which the Shivaji festivals held out before the people, the following description would give a fair idea. "Fiery speeches were made and Tilak himself said that a higher morality than that of the Indian Penal Code, in the usual ethical teachings of the East and the West, governs the life of nations; and Shivaji was fully justified in killing Afzal Khan, because it was a great unselfish act for national self-preservation. 'God has not conferred on the Mlechha a grant of Hindustan inscribed on imperishable brass'. Another speaker said: 'Who dares to call that man a murderer who, when only nine years old, had received Divine inspiration not to bow down before a Mahommedan Emperor? Who dares to condemn Shivaji for disregarding a minor duty in the performance of a major one? Had Shivaji committed five or fifty crimes more terrible, I would have been equally ready to prostrate myself not once but one hundred times before the image of our lord Shivaji. . . .Every Hindu, every Mahratta must rejoice at this spectacle, for we too are all striving to regain our lost independence, and it is only by combination that we can throw off the yoke."[10]

All these points of view found eloquent expression during the celebration of the Shivaji festival at Poona on 12 June, 1897. Learned discourses were given on Shivaji, depicting him as a valiant fighter for the sake of his religion and motherland. In one of the meetings over which Tilak presided, Professor Bhanu defended Shivaji against the charge of murdering Afzal Khan. Professor Jinsivale also supported him by citing the similar doings of other historical empire-builders like Napoleon and Caesar. In his closing speech Tilak wound up the proceedings by "distilling out before the audience the inner patriotic motive of that deed and made a feeling appeal to the public to assemble at least for a day during the 364 of the whole year to pay their tribute to the memory of that great nation-builder".[11] A detailed report of the proceedings of this meeting was published in the *Kesari* with some editorial comments. A poem was also published in its columns in which the following verses, among others, were put in the mouth of Shivaji.

"I delivered my country by establishing '*Swarāj*' and saving religion. I planted in the soil of Maharashtra virtues that may be likened to the *Kalpavriksha* (one of the five trees of Indra's Paradise that yields whatsoever may be desired), sublime policy based on strong foundations, valour in the battlefield like that of Karna, patriotism, genuine unselfishness, and unity, the best of all. Alas, alas, all I see now is the ruin of my country. Those forts of mine to build which I poured out money, to acquire which torrents of fiery blood streamed forth, from which I sallied forth to victory roaring like a lion—all those are crumbling away. What a desolation is this! Foreigners are dragging out Lakshmī (the goddess of fortune) by the hands of persecution. Along with her, plenty has fled, and with plenty, health.

"Say, where are those splendid ones who promptly shed their blood on the spot where my perspiration fell? People eat bread once in a day, and not even enough of that. They toil through hard times by tightening up their bellies...The cow...is taken daily to the slaughter house and ruthlessly butchered by the unbelievers...... How can I bear this heart-rending spectacle? Have all our leaders become like helpless figures on the chess-board? What misfortune has overtaken the land?"[12]

There is no doubt that the Shivaji festival assumed a decidedly political character. The discourses on Shivaji were definitely intended to rouse patriotic feelings and awaken national consciousness among the people. But the festival was not confined to such discussions and discourses. Its regular features included, among other things, big public processions in which bands of volunteers showed their skill in fencing, music parties sang religious and patriotic songs, and stories and poems were recited to inculcate national sentiments. Some of these were definitely revolutionary in character as will be shown later.

Within ten days of the Shivaji festival held at Poona, Mr. Rand, the Collector of Poona, and another officer, Lieut. Ayerst, were shot dead while returning from the Government House at night. The murder was committed by the Chapekar brothers in order to avenge the atrocities perpetrated by the British soldiers employed in enforcing preventive measures against the plague epidemic in the city of Poona. But Tilak was held indirectly responsible for the crime by the Anglo-Indian circles, and the Anglo-Indian Press demanded his prosecution. The Government yielded, and Tilak was arrested on a charge of sedition. The charge mainly rested on the speech of Tilak at the Shivaji festival, and in particular to that part of it in which he defended the murder of Afzal Khan by Shivaji. In reply, Tilak's counsel referred to the festivities in memory of Robert

Bruce and William Wallace, and pointed out that many persons, besides Tilak, took part in the controversy about Afzal Khan's murder, and it was in the press long before Rand's murder. Nevertheless, Tilak was convicted of sedition. The trying judge admitted that there was no evidence to prove any connection between Tilak's articles and Rand's murder; but he put a new construction on the word 'disaffection' (occurring in Section 124A of the Penal Code), and took it to mean 'absence of affection'. He held that absence of affection amounted to presence of hatred against the Government in a man's mind, and as such fell within the purview of section 124 A.

Tilak was sentenced to 18 months' rigorous imprisonment (July 22). This baptism of fire enhanced his reputation and advanced the national cause. Sympathy for Tilak was felt and expressed all over India. All Indian newspapers, without exception, censured the Government and congratulated Tilak. A wave of discontent and indignation passed over the whole country. Even the untutored mill-hands fasted in protest and struck work for six days. The colleges and schools were deserted and the students wore the black mark, indicative of the deep sorrow they felt in their hearts. The most impressive demonstrations were witnessed and the *bazars* (markets) were spontaneously closed.[12a]

People rightly held that Tilak was really persecuted for his sturdy spirit of independence, strong national sentiments, and fearless criticism of unjust measures of the Government, particularly their anti-plague policy and repression practised by Mr. Rand and his myrmidons. The proud disdain with which Tilak refused to offer an apology to the Government after his conviction offered a marked contrast to the conduct of Gokhale who tendered an humble apology to the Government for statements he had made in England with respect to the violent acts of soldiers during the plague epidemic.[13] Much might be said in justification of Gokhale, but his abject surrender to the Government, without any proper inquiry into alleged violences, completely whitewashed the vile and heinous doings of the British soldiers, whereas Tilak really suffered for his courageous protest against their conduct.

This difference between Gokhale and Tilak, as well as the Congress session of 1897 (held at Amraoti), throws a lurid light on the growing cleavage between the old school of politics and the new spirit of nationalism. Although public sympathy for Tilak was being continuously expressed all over India, the proposal to pass a special resolution about him in the Amraoti Congress was thwarted by the influence of the Moderate party. Eloquent tributes were, however, paid to Tilak by Sankaran Nair, the President of the Congress, Surendra-nath Banerji, and others. "When Babu Surendranath Banerji reached the peak of his superb oratory while speaking of Tilak, people in the Congress rose to their feet in reverence, triumphantly cried out, echoed and re-echoed the name of Tilak, and clapped their hands with such a tremendous enthusiasm that even the stentorian voice of that renowned Demosthenes of India was very nearly drowned. Newspapers of the day described that magnificent scene in the Congress as unprecedented in its history".

The trial and conviction of Tilak may be regarded as a landmark in the history of Indian nationalism. Henceforth sacrifice and sufferings in the cause of the country, rather than eloquence and debating skill, came to be regarded as the badge of honour and distinction. The martyrs replaced mere orators as acknowledged champions of liberty, and the homage of the nation was no longer paid to intellectual brilliance in politics, but was reserved for the sturdy spirit that bravely challenged autocracy without any fear.

Though the charges against Tilak were substantiated by his writings and speeches in connection with the Shivaji festival, it survived his incarceration. After the release of Tilak "huge festivals were again celebrated at Raigarh". In spite of the bitter attacks of the Moderates and the hostile attitude of the Government, the Shivaji festival became a permanent feature of Maharashtra, and even travelled to distant Bengal. It inspired the great poet Rabindranath to write, in memory of the hero of Maharashtra, one of his finest poems, which made such a profound appeal to the national sentiment of Bengal that the Government had to proscribe it to prevent the spread of excitement against the British.

The inauguration of Shivaji festival was a memorable contribution of Tilak to the development of Indian nationalism. He rightly thought that round the personality of Shivaji, he could gather all the patriotic and national forces: "The inspiration which western democratic teachings gave to us was rather weak and essentially outlandish. But the worship of Shivaji was such as even the ignorant villager could understand. The name of Shivaji was symbol of unity, courage, sacrifice. It connoted the highest patriotic fervour. It stood for complete political emancipation. Shivaji and *Swaraj* were synonymous words. By starting the Shivaji festival in 1895, Tilak stimulated the national instincts of the people. He gave a message to the people freed from the puzzling verbiage of western democracy and which being simple and direct went straight to their hearts."[14]

There is scarcely any doubt that Ganapati and Shivaji festivals served well the purpose for which they were inaugurated by Tilak. They spread among the masses not only a feeling of pride and glory in their past, but also aroused in them an ardent desire for political freedom which was symbolised by the career and character of Shivaji.

Tilak was twice[14a] sentenced to imprisonment for his political views. He accepted the punishment—rare in those days—with calmness and equanimity, and expressed his belief that perhaps he would serve the national cause far better from within the prison wall than by remaining outside it. As in many other respects, so also in this matter, he set an example which inspired others to brave the wrath of the Government and undergo sacrifices for the national cause.

Tilak's views and career have been described at some length because he typified the new nationalist spirit which was gathering force and was destined ere long to sweep the whole country. He fully deserves the high tribute paid to him in the following passages:

"Like Socrates, Tilak brought political philosophy in India from heaven to earth, from the Council Hall or the Congress *mandap* to the street and the market. Politics so far was comparatively a feeble affair,—it lacked life. It is the great merit of Tilak that he put a new self-confidence, a new self-assertiveness into his people...... It was reserved for Tilak to make both the Government and professional politicians look for a new power, viz., the people. It was one of the standing arguments of the official party that the Congress did not represent the people. Tilak cleverly turned the tables on the Government by boldly identifying himself with the masses. Tilak's attempt to democratise the political movement and bring it home vividly into the consciousness of the average man, infused a new life and vigour into the movement and gave it a very different character."[15]

"To bring in the mass of the people, to found the greatness of the future on the greatness of the past, to infuse Indian politics with Indian religious fervour, are the indispensable conditions for a great and powerful awakening in India. Others—writers, thinkers, spiritual leaders—had seen this truth; Tilak was the first to bring it into the actual field of practical politics".[16]

It has been truly remarked that "Tilak has contributed more by his life and character than by his speeches or writings to the making of the new nationalism". His "selfless patriotism, indomitable courage and fierce determination," and above all, "his supreme concentration, without reservation, of his life to the one great aim, viz., the freedom of his country", may be said to mark a new epoch in the political struggle for India's freedom.[17]

Tilak's efforts were ably seconded by Bipin-chandra Pal, Arabinda Ghosh, Lala Lajpat Rai, Khaparde and others. They raised the standard of revolt against what they called the mendicant policy of the Congress, and preached the cult of self-help in different parts of India through books, journals and lectures. The writings and speeches of these men breathed a new spirit of boldness and self-confidence. They instilled a reverence for the past and confidence for the future, and asserted the inalienable right of the Indians to shape their destiny without caring for the frowns or smiles of the alien rulers.

Arabinda Ghosh was the most typical representative of the new type of nationalism in its most intense metaphysical and religious form. Nationalism with him was not a political or economic cry; it was the innermost hunger of his whole soul for the re-birth in him, and through men like him in the whole of India, of the ancient culture of Hindusthan in its pristine purity and nobility.

"What is nationalism?" he asked. "Nationalism is not a mere political programme. Nationalism is a religion that has come from God. Nationalism is a creed in which you shall have to live. Nationalism is not going to be crushed. Nationalism is immortal; nationalism cannot die".[18] "This nationalism is not a trick of the intellect; it is an attitude of the heart, of the soul; it springs from the deepest part of our nature which intellect can never fathom. What the intellect could not do, this mighty force of passionate conviction, born out of the very depths of the national consciousness, will be able to accomplish".[19] Bipin-chandra Pal further elucidated the idea. "The new spirit", said he, "accepts no other teacher in the art of self-government except self-government itself. It values freedom for its own sake, and desires autonomy, immediate and unconditioned, regardless of any considerations of fitness and unfitness of the people for it; because it does not believe serfdom in any shape or form to be a school for real freedom in any country and under any conditions whatsoever. It holds that the struggle for freedom itself is the highest tutor of freedom which, if it can once possess the mind of a people, shapes itself the life, the character, and the social and civic institutions of the people, to its own proper ends.

"The time has come when in the interests of truth and the civic advancement and freedom of the people, our British friends should be distinctly told that while we are thankful to them for all the kind things they have said all these years for us, and the ready sacrifices they have made to make our lot easy and their yoke light, we cannot any longer suffice[19a] to be guided by them in our efforts for political progress and emancipation. Their view-point is not ours. They desire to make the Government of India popular, without ceasing in any sense to be essentially British, we desire to make it autonomous, absolutely free of the absolute control".[20]

Eminent Moderate leaders have expressed the opinion that B. C. Pal's articles in the *New India* gave rise to the extremist section in the Congress.[20a] He preached in a popular form the philosophy of Vivekananda and Arabinda Ghosh to which reference has been made above. Lajpat Rai, Khaparde and others were, like Tilak, hard-grained practical politicians who strove to leaven politics with this new element. The combined efforts of these leaders and their followers ushered in an altogether new movement in Indian politics which developed distinct features of its own, fundamentally different from the Congress school of the day. Some of these basic differences are noted below. For the sake of convenience, the two schools may be referred to as the Congress and the Nationalist School, without any further implication.

The Congress School sincerely believed that India was not yet in a position to stand on her own legs, and needed British rule for many years to make her fit for self-government. This mentality is clearly reflected in the Presidential address in the Congress of 1897, the very year in which Tilak was imprisoned for sedition. Here is an extract from the speech of Sankaran Nair who presided: "We are also aware that with the decline of British supremacy, we shall have anarchy, war, and rapine. The Mahomedans will try to recover their lost supremacy. The Hindu races and chiefs will fight amongst themselves. The lower castes who have come under the vivifying influence of Western civilisation are scarcely likely to yield without a struggle to the dominion of the higher castes".

The Nationalists were not deterred by these considerations, and advocated liberty from foreign control on abstract principles. The whole position was summed up by Tilak in one sentence which has become classic: "Swaraj is my birth-right and I must have it." Arabinda Ghosh was an uncompromising champion of the same policy. "Can the wealth of the whole world," passionately exclaimed Lajpat Rai, "be put in the scales over against liberty and honour?" "A subject people," he continued, "has no soul, just as a slave can have none... A man without a soul is a mere animal. A nation without a soul is only a herd of dumb driven cattle".[21]

It was further urged by many that the Indians were not yet fit for carrying on their own administration, and a period of political apprenticeship was necessary for this purpose. It was also freely argued that freedom was a cry for the moon so long as social abuses, religious superstitions, communal rivalry, and illiteracy of the people were not removed, and the Indians did not have sufficient military knowledge to defend their country.

The Nationalists denied the logic behind these arguments and held that if India had to wait for the removal of these defects she would have to wait till doomsday. They further argued that a foreign rule was more likely to perpetuate those evils than remove them.

The Congress School believed that the British rule in India was a divine dispensation, and piously hoped that under their guidance India would one day attain self-government. The Nationalists did not believe that a foreign ruler could ever have benevolent intentions towards the subject people, and pointed out that in all essential matters the British interests were bound to be in conflict with the true interests of the Indians. Far from believing in the providential character of the British rule, the Nationalists represented the British conquest of India as achieved by fraud and chicanery, inspired by greed, and maintained for purely selfish interests.

Unlike the Congress School the Nationalists did not pin their faith on the benevolence of the Viceroys or the sense of justice of the British people or any British party. The change in the outlook is beautifully expressed in the following passage:

> "Our eyes have been turned away from the Government: away from the Houses of Parliament: from Simla and Calcutta; and our faces have turned now to the starving, the naked, the patient, and long-suffering 300 millions of Indian people, and in it we see a new potency, because we view them now with an eye of love which we had never felt before, and in the teeming, toiling, starving and naked populations of India, we find possibilities, potentialities, germs that have given rise to the movement namely, Faith in the people, Faith in the genius of the nation, Faith in God, Who has been guiding the genius of this nation through ages by historical evolution, Faith in the eternal destiny of the Indian people. With the decadence of our faith in the foreign Government and in the foreign nation, has grown up this higher, this dearer, this deeper, this more vital and more divine faith in Indian Humanity."[22]

The followers of the Congress School accepted the position that the British Government was established by law in India, and were not prepared to go beyond the bounds of the law as promulgated by the Government from time to time, even though they might have thoroughly disapproved of it. Their only method of approach was therefore by constitutional agitation. The Nationalists believed in certain inherent rights of man, and whenever any Government legislation violated those rights they did not regard themselves as morally bound to obey it. To them constitutional agitation in India was meaningless because India had no constitution, and everything in the ultimate analysis was really a fiat of the executive authorities.[23] Sir Ashu-tosh Chaudhuri gave expression to the same feeling when he said in 1904 that a "subject race has no politics". This fundamental difference in outlook distinguished the two Schools as regards the method of agitation against the Government and the general approach to the whole political problem in India.

A typical instance of fundamental difference is furnished by the conceptions of the two schools of political thought regarding the ultimate political goal of India. The Indian National Congress formulated various schemes of political advancement, but they mainly centred on reorganization of administrative machinery through such measures of reform as Indianisation of services, admission of Indians into the Legislative Councils in increasing numbers and entrusting them with greater powers and responsibility. But it had no definite conception of the ultimate political goal. Due to the influence of the new spirit of nationalism some prominent leaders of the Congress, at the very end of the period under review, vaguely looked upon Colonial self-government within the British Empire as a goal to be realised at a distant date. Gokhale, for example, expressed some such idea in 1905, but the Congress as a body did not accept that view. On the other hand, the Nationalists aspired after freedom and this was pithily expressed by Tilak in his famous dictum, "Swaraj is my birth-right", which caught the imagination of the new school and became its rallying cry. As a matter of fact, the ideal of freedom from British yoke was not new and was echoed in Indian literature even before the Congress was born. But the Congress kept itself at a safe distance from this ideal which was, not without reason, regarded as inconceivable and dangerous by most of its leaders. This ideal of freedom, however, loomed large in the new Nationalist movement.

The difference between the political thoughts and beliefs of the Congress and the new Nationalism was thus a fundamental one, both as regards ideal and method. It was a difference in kind and not merely of degree. The Nationalists were, consciously or unconsciously, the exponents of an altogether new ideal and spirit to which the old leaders of the Congress were strangers. This new development was undoubtedly of very slow growth, and was not clearly realized until the very end of the period under review. But it was manifested, from the year 1905 onwards, by the sharp differences which arose between the official Congress party and its left wing—the so-called Extremists—on all important political questions and problems with which the country was confronted.

But the Leftists in the Congress, led by Tilak, represented only the moderate section of the new Nationalist movement, which also had a left wing, bent upon achieving freedom by armed rebellion. The votaries of this new cult had no faith either in the constitutional agitation of the Congress or in the less legal means contemplated by Tilak. They sincerely believed that freedom of India could not be achieved save by violent means, for the very simple reason that history did not record a single instance where foreign rule was liquidated by other means. In order to prepare grounds for open rebellion they formed secret societies with a view to manufacturing arms or importing them from outside. Although this movement did not come into prominence till after the end of the period under review, its origin goes back to the nineteenth century. It is generally referred to as 'Terrorism' or 'Anarchical Conspiracy' in official parlance, but it should more properly be called 'Militant Nationalism', for there is no doubt that it was the product of the new Nationalist movement.

II. BEGINNINGS OF MILITANT NATIONALISM

Reference has been made above to the growth of amateur or mushroom secret societies in Calcutta, on the model of the Carbonari in Italy, as far back as the seventies of the nineteenth century.[24] There are also stray references to the formation of similar societies, even in Patna. The credit of organising the first secret society, with the avowed object of overthrowing the British Government in India, goes to Wasudeo Balwant Phadke, whose activities have been described above.[25] For nearly twenty years after the tragic end of this great Maratha hero no further trace of this movement is found in Maharashtra. It is not till the close of the nineteenth century that we find the revival of the old spirit for which Phadke lived and died. Its first signs in Maharashtra may be traced to the expression of bitter hatred against the British Government and almost open incitement to rebellion against it. The Ganapati and Shivaji festivals, noted above, were utilised for preaching this new spirit.[26] During the ten days' celebration of the Ganapati festival, "leaflets were circulated by schoolboys and others broadcast through the city calling the Hindus to arms, urging the Marathas to rebel as Shivaji did, declaring that the dagger of subjection to foreign rule penetrated the bosom of all, and urging that a religious outbreak should be made the first step towards the overthrow of the alien power."[27] The Shivaji festival also provided suitable opportunities for similar propaganda. A regular society was organised to give physical and military training to the Hindus. The life and soul of this society were the two brothers of a Chitpāvan Brahman family of Maharashtra, named Damodar Chapekar and Balkrishna Chapekar. The following verses were recited by them at the Shivaji and Ganapati festivals:

1. *The Shivaji Śloka*

"Merely reciting Shivaji's story like a lord (?) does not secure independence; it is necessary to be prompt in engaging in desperate enterprises like Shivaji and Baji; knowing, you good people should take up swords and shields at all events now; we shall cut off countless heads of enemies. Listen. We shall risk our lives on the battlefield in a national war; we shall shed upon the earth the life-blood of the enemies who destroy our religion; we shall die after killing only, while you will hear the story like women."

2. *The Ganapati Śloka*

Alas, you are not ashamed to remain in servitude; try therefore to commit suicide; alas, like butchers, the wicked in their monstrous atrocity kill calves and kine; free her (the cow) from her trouble; die but kill the English; do not remain idle or thereby burden the earth; this is called Hindustan, how is it that the English rule here?"[28]

On 22 June, 1897, the Chapekar brothers—Damodar and Balkrishna—murdered two British officers, Rand and Lieut. Ayerst, while they were returning from the Government House, Poona, after attending the Diamond Jubilee celebration of Queen Victoria's Coronation. The Chapekars intended to kill only Rand, but the other, who was closely following in another carriage, was shot by accident or through mistake. The murder of Rand was meant to avenge the insults and oppressions committed under his authority in connection with the measures undertaken to prevent the spread of the plague epidemic.

In order to understand the feelings which prompted the Chapekar brothers to commit this murder, and to take a proper perspective of their action, it is necessary to give some idea of the state of things which prevailed in Poona. This may be gathered from the written complaint submitted to the Government by Natu, a leading Poona Sirdar. The following extract from the Presidential address of Sankaran Nair at the Indian National Congress of 1897 gives a summary of the complaints of this kind:

"This inspection of houses by soldiers seems to have been carried out without notice by forcing open, very often unnecessarily when there were other means of entrance, the locks of the shops and the houses when the owners were absent, and absolutely no attempt was made to protect the properties or the house. No notice was taken of complaints concerning them. A Hindu lady was assaulted by a soldier, and Mr. Natu reported the matter to the authorities producing the witnesses. No notice was vouchsafed. The soldiers were refractory, and any complaint against them was obstruction. When a man fell ill, many neighbouring families were taken to the segregation camp and left there without any covering to protect their body or any furniture, their property at home including horses, cows and sheep being left unprotected. A man was unnecessarily taken to the hospital and sent back as not being affected by plague to find his furniture destroyed and his poor wife and relatives forcibly removed and detained in the segregation camp. Temples were defiled by soldiers and his own temple was entered by them, on account, Natu believes, of his impertinence in making a complaint. An old man who succeeded in satisfying the search party that he was not suffering from plague was detained in jail some hours for having obstructed the search party, the obstruction apparently consisting in the delay caused by him. Insult was the reward for the services of volunteers, and their suggestions were treated with contumacy. You all know how sensitive our Mahomedan fellow-subjects are about the privacy of their women. And when Mr. Natu suggested that the services of Mahomedan volunteers should be availed of to search the Mahomedan quarter, he was told that his conduct was improper and his services voluntarily rendered were dispensed with. Mr. Natu brought all this to the notice of the officials, pointed out that the operations were carried on against the spirit of the rules and complained that there was a great amount of unrest. The Indian newspapers gave prominence to these and similar complaints. They compared the English Government to other Governments very much to the disadvantage of the former. The *Mahratta* complained: 'Plague is more merciful to us than its human prototypes now reigning in the city.' The tyranny of the Plague Committee and its chosen instruments is yet too brutal to allow respectable people to breathe at ease. And it was added that, 'every one of these grievances may be proved to the hilt if His Excellency is pleased to enquire into the details".[29]

The Chapekar brothers killed Rand as he was the President of the Plague Committee under whose instructions and authority the operations mentioned above were carried out. Whether all the charges were true or not is immaterial for our present consideration. The truth of these very serious charges was never investigated and they were believed to be true by the Indians. Even Gokhale, who was then in England, referred to these atrocities in the English press, but as soon as he came to India he offered an humble apology. The Natu brothers who were prepared to substantiate the charges were not given an opportunity to do so, but were deported without trial.

The Europeans were thrown into a frenzy over the murder of two European officials, and "an attack was commenced on the Vernacular Press and the educated Indians, perhaps unexampled in its virulence since the Mutiny. . . . It was suggested as a matter for regret that the native mind had forgotten the lessons of the last Mutiny, that a fresh mutiny would clear the air, particularly as the Mahrattas were not in the show of 1857".[30] As stated above, it was mainly this outburst of European feeling that was responsible for the conviction of Tilak, though, as the trying judge admitted, there was nothing to connect Tilak with the murder of Rand.[31]

The Chapekar brothers were hanged, but the two Dravid brothers, who had been rewarded by Government for information which led to the arrest and conviction of Damodar Chapekar, were murdered on 8 February, 1899, by the third Chapekar brother, Vasudev, and his friend. They were also hanged. Evidently the society founded by the Chapekar brothers survived their death; no other activities of this body are known, but two unsuccessful attempts on the life of a Chief Constable at Poona may be ascribed to it.

It is, however, known from the autobiographical sketch of Arabinda Ghosh[32], that a secret society was started in Western India before the end of the nineteenth century with a Rajput noble at the head. This had a council of five in Bombay with several prominent Maratha politicians as its members. This Rajput leader was not a prince, that is to say, a ruling Chief, but a noble of the State with the title of Ṭhākur. The Ṭhākur was not a member of the Council in Bombay, but he stood above it as the leader of the whole movement, while the Council helped him to organize Maharashtra and the Maratha States. He himself worked principally upon the Indian army of which he had already won over two or three regiments. But no further information is available of the activities of this secret society.

The next phase of revolutionary activity in Maharashtra centres round Vinayak Damodar Savarkar, who may be said to have been a born revolutionary. It is said that when the story of Chapekar brothers reached him, he, then a boy of fifteen, took a vow before the goddess Durgā to fulfil the mission of the martyred Chapekars by driving out the British from India. In 1900 he started an Association at Nasik called Mitra Melā. Its objective was political independence of India, and it emphatically asserted that such an independence could be won, if need be, by armed revolt. In 1904 this Association was developed at Poona and adopted the new name, 'Abhinava Bhārata', after Mazzini's Young Italy.[33]

There were also some revolutionary activities in Madhya Pradesh organized by the 'Ārya Bāndhav Samāj'. Its object was to drive the British out of India by collecting a secret army of thousands of batches of four. But no detailed account of its activities is known. The Samāj was probably started at the beginning of the twentieth century.

About the same time revolutionary movement was also developed in Bengal.[34] A revolutionary secret society, known as the 'Anuśīlan Samiti', was organized in Calcutta under the leadership of P. Mitra, Bar-at-Law. A similar organization was planned by Arabinda Ghosh, who was then at Baroda. He sent Jatindra-nath Bandyopadhyay, who set up a secret organization in Calcutta which was soon amalgamated with the Anusilan Samiti.

The members of the Anusilan Samiti, mostly young students, were trained in military drill, sword and *lāṭhi*-play, boxing, wrestling and other kinds of physical exercise. They were also given moral and patriotic training through regular weekly classes and general conversations held by eminent men like Rabindra-nath Tagore, Guru-das Banerji, B. C. Pal and many others. The members practised worship of arms in place of the images of goddess Durgā. There were various branches of the Anusilan Samiti, and there were probably also several other secret societies acting independently of one another. The main activities of the Anusilan Samiti were carried on by some clubs in Calcutta. Its members also committed dacoities to procure funds, though this was not liked by the President, P. Mitra.

Barindra-kumar Ghosh, younger brother of Arabinda, also joined the Anusilan Samiti, but soon dissensions broke out among its different branches. Arabinda came to Calcutta in order to unite the different secret societies in Bengal with a common programme and under a common direction. He spent a large amount of money for these societies, and funds were also subscribed by C. R. Das and others. Unfortunately, a quarrel broke out between Jatindra and Barindra, and Arabinda came to Calcutta a second time. He made extensive tours, visited the different secret societies, and also met leading men of some districts. He found that in Bengal the prevailing mood was apathy and despair. He decided to bide his time and in the meanwhile to continue his political work in silence behind the scene, for the moment for public work had not yet come. The

Anusilan Samiti, however, continued, though in a languishing condition. How it was galvanized into activity by the *Swadeshi* movement will be related later.

---

1. Cf. Vol. IX, p. 773.
2. For the criticism of the Congress by Bankim-chandra and Aswini Datta, see p. 567.
3. Published on 27 August, 1894. *Essay on Bankimchandra Chatterji* by Arabinda (Pondicherry, 1954), p. 47.
4. Published on 28 August, 1893; Mukherjee, *Sri Aurobindo's Political Thought*, pp. 75-77.
5. Lajpat Rai, III. 146.
6. Ibid, 140-1.
7. Buch-II, 83-5.

7a. Ibid, 29; Athalye, *Tilak,* 84-5.

8. Kelkar, *Tilak,* 284-6.
9. Karmarkar, *Tilak,* 215.
10. Buch-II. 28-9.
11. Kelkar, *Tilak,* 368-9.
12. Buch-II, 30.

12a. Athalye, *Tilak,* 209.

13. Kelkar, *Tilak,* 374.
14. Athalye, *Tilak,* 106.

14a. In 1897 and 1908. Tilak had also been sentenced to simple imprisonment for four months in 1882 on a charge of defamation.

15. Buch-II, 25.
16. Ibid, 26.
17. Ibid, 24.
18. Ibid, 187.
19. Ibid.

19a. This seems to be a mistake for 'suffer'.

20. Buch-II, 90-1.

20a. Chintamani, p. 54. He also refers to the fact that the Maharaja of Natore, as Chairman of the Reception Committee of the Congress held in Calcutta in 1901, characterised the Congress agitation as political mendicancy. Such criticisms of the Congress and even strong condemnations were a common feature of Bengal politics long before 1908. H.P. Ghosh, who won renown as a great journalist later in life, wrote a trenchant criticism against the Congress in the *New India* (11 November, 1901). It is to be noted that Bipin-chandra Pal, the editor of the *New India,* repudiated the idea of Ghosh and supported the Congress. As a matter of fact, Bipin-chandra Pal held the views of the Moderates till the proposal of the Partition of Bengal changed him into an ardent nationalist or Extremist in 1904. Cf. Mukherji, Haridas and Uma, *Bipin Chandra Pal and India's Struggle for Swaraj,* pp. 11 ff.

21. Lajpat Rai-III, 86.
22. Buch-II, 93.
23. Ibid, 113-4.
24. See p. 484. Rabindra-nath Tagore, in his boyhood, was a member of a secret society where, to use his own words, he was initiated into the vow of achieving freedom of India. Rajnarain Bose was the *guru* of the society, and the elder brother of Rabindra-nath was also an enthusiastic member. *Ātmaparichaya* (in Bengali) by Rabindra-nath Tagore.
25. Cf. Vol. IX, pp. 908-14.
26. See pp. 578 ff.
27. *Sedition (Rowlatt) Committee Report,* p. 1.
28. Ibid, p. 2. Quoted from the autobiography of Damodar Chapekar.
29. *Congress Presidential Address,* Natesan, Vol. I, 331-2.
30. Sankaran Nair's Address, ibid, 337. Chintamani (p. 29) gives an account of the repressive measures that followed the murder of Rand.
31. See p. 582.
32. *Sri Aurobindo on himself,* later incorporated in a bigger book entitled *Sri Aurobindo on himself and on the Mother,* published by the Pondicherry Asram.
33. Dhananjay Keer, *Savarkar and his Times,* pp. 6, 9, 24.
34. The account that follows is based on the Bengali book *Bhārater Dvitīya Svādhīnatā Saṅgrāma,* Vol. I, by Bhupendranath Datta, pp. 179 ff., 190 fff.

CHAPTER XVII (LV)

INDIAN SERFS AND SLAVES IN THE BRITISH EMPIRE

I. IN INDIA

TEA-GARDEN LABOURERS IN ASSAM

1. *The history of the Coolies in Assam Tea Gardens*

The condition of the labourers in tea-gardens was in some respects much worse than those who suffered from the oppression of indigo-planters. The latter were legally free men, and the outrages on them were mostly committed before public gaze, or at least within public knowledge, save, of course, when the victims were kept in dark dungeons. But even then their confinement was a matter of public knowledge, though no remedy was available.

The labourers in Assam tea-gardens, generally called coolies, though not born as slaves, formed a body of legalised serfs, and their lot was hardly less miserable than that of the negro-slaves in American plantations. A poor ignorant coolie, born a free man, was tricked by force and fraud to leave his (or her) home and to register himself as a labourer under contract in a tea-garden; and once this was done, he was absolutely in the clutches of the manager. There, within the secret enclave of the garden, far away from public gaze, he had to live the life of a slave, at the absolute mercy of the two or three European managers and assistant managers who were practically under no restraint, and did as they pleased with the hundreds of illiterate and helpless men and women. It was only occasionally, by mere accident, that outside public came to know how these wretched men and women, ill-fed, ill-clad and ill-housed, were mercilessly caned, kicked or otherwise brutally assaulted, openly in the presence of other coolies, and how the female coolies had to minister to the Sahib's pleasure whenever he chose to send for her. If they tried to escape from the garden they were easily caught and subjected to still harsher treatment. Many of the coolies succumbed to the assaults and injuries, but the criminal was hardly ever brought to trial. In the few cases where he had to stand a trial, he was acquitted or received nominal punishment on the strength of a medical certificate that the death of the coolie was due to the rupture of enlarged spleen. These grave allegations were frequently brought to the notice of the Government, but no inquiry was ever instituted as was done in the case of the indigo-planters; the obvious reason being that the crimes in the tea-garden, mostly hidden from the public, did not excite the same interest. But the tales of the woes and miseries of the coolies were narrated by those few among them who had the good fortune to effect their escape or to come out alive after their period of contract was over. Besides, pathetic stories of outrages upon individual coolies were reported in the Indian newspapers. The general truth of these is proved by revelations made, unconsciously or in an unguarded moment, by some of the highest officials, including the Chief Commissioner of Assam. Public attention was drawn to the pitiable condition of the labourers in Assam tea-gardens by Pandit Ram-kumar Vidyāratna, a preacher of the Sādhāran Brāhma Samāj. His Bengali book, *Kuli-Kāhinī* (Story of the Coolies) belongs to the same type as the *Uncle Tom's Cabin,* and is not much inferior to it in evoking pity and sympathy for a degraded and unfortunate class or community. A detailed account of the woes and miseries of the coolies will be given in section 3.

The history of this community may be briefly told.

Since the growth of tea-plantations in Assam during the forties, necessity was felt for recruiting labourers from outside. Local supply was insufficient, and the conditions of work were not tempting enough to induce people to work in the garden of their own free will. So a network of agents was set up to secure recruits, preferably from distant places where the conditions of service in tea-plantations were hardly known. The tempting remuneration induced the agents to secure recruits by all possible means, fair or foul. They very often kidnapped men, even young girls, for the purpose, or induced them to leave home on false pretences of giving good appointments and then carried their helpless victims to the coolie depots. It soon became notorious that the system of recruiting was a fruitful source of oppression. It was regulated by Act XIII of 1859 by which the garden authorities had to enter into an agreement or contract with the coolie before he could be employed in a garden. But this was worthless as a safeguard, for the latter, being illiterate and ignorant, did not understand the purport of the contract he was induced to accept. The value of such a contract may be realized from the following extract of a Report by the Chief Commissioner of Assam. "A contract", says the Chief Commissioner, "may be enforced under this Act, though it is not in writing, though it is not stamped, though it is not registered, though it has not been presented for verification before any official, though there is no proof (other than what evidence is produced in the trial) that the labourer understood the terms of the engagement, though the terms may be manifestly unfair. A labourer cannot free himself by redemption, nor can he plead any misconduct of his employer as an excuse for non-performance..."[1]

The grave abuses of this Act, to which the attention of the Government was repeatedly drawn, induced Lord Ripon to enact the Inland Emigration Bill which became Act I of 1882. While the Bill was under consideration, the Indian Association of Calcutta made a representation which 'exposed, in true colours, the pathetic condition of the coolies in tea-gardens'. Referring to it Lord Ripon observed:

"I have before me a very fair and temperate representation which has been made by the Indian Association within the last two or three days. They have argued the subject very fairly, and they have put forward objections to certain parts of the Bill which are well entitled to consideration. They press upon us in their memorial this point of the ignorance of the cooly and give a curious extract from a book published by a Missionary of the Brahmo Samaj (Ram Kumar Vidyaratna), to show how very ignorant the greater number of the coolies who engage to go to Assam are. I have no doubt that that is a perfectly fair statement of the knowledge of many of the coolies, but I do claim for the Bill that it takes the utmost possible care that the labourer should thoroughly understand the nature of the engagement he is about to enter into".[2]

The hopes of Lord Ripon were not realized and the pitiable condition of the coolies was not much improved even after the passing of the Act of 1882. The Bengali newspapers, particularly the *Sanjīvanī*, edited by Krishna-kumar Mitra, regularly published the heart-rending stories of the coolies. "These revealed a ghastly tale of horror and a condition of things which practically amounted to a species of slavery thriving under the protection of British laws and sanctioned by the British Government".[3] The Indian Association again took up the question. In 1886 they sent their Assistant Secretary, Dwaraka-nath Ganguli, to inquire personally into the condition of the tea-garden labourers in Assam. "As an emissary of the Indian Association, its Assistant Secretary Dwarkanath toured the tea districts of Assam, entered and stayed at tea-gardens incognito to see personally the condition of the labourers—men, women and children. He discovered dungeons in the gardens where recalcitrant men and women were kept as punishment. Physical torture of various kinds was the order of the day. The Brahmo Missionary, Pandit Shiva Nath Sastri, was also at the time on a religious tour in these districts.

Dwarka-nath accompanied him to Dhubri, Goalpara, Tejpur, Naogaon, Shibsagar, Dibrugarh and other places.

"Shiva Nath Sastri has given us a graphic description of how selfless and heroic Dwarka-nath faced all the difficulties in their way with utmost resignation, and how even the religious meetings organised for him were attended by Government officials, even of the rank of Deputy Commissioner, to note down anything that might be said by Dwarka-nath to the public. Dwarka-nath wrote Bengali articles for the *Sanjīvanī* and English articles for the *Bengalee*, narrating the slave condition of the Assam labourers and the harrowing tales of their life-long misery."[4] He placed before the Committee of the Indian Association all the facts and figures gathered from personal inquiry. On the basis of these as well "as the judgements of several cases against the recruiters, Government officials and tea-garden managers, the Committee were in a position to prepare a long and documented memorial on the subject of the tea-garden labourer and place it in the hands of the Government and the public on 5th May 1888. The memorial dealt with the entire 'coolie' question, and the conclusions of the Committee were supported by extracts from official documents. The memorial was warmly supported by the Indian Press".[5]

The following account is mainly based on this memorial. For the sake of convenience the main items of complaint against the system may be discussed *seriatim.*

2. *System of Recruiting Coolies*

The following extract from the memorial sums up the position regarding recruits: "In the representation which the Committee of this Association made to the Government of Lord Ripon when the Bill which subsequently became Act I of 1882 was under consideration, they pointed out that the system of recruiting was liable to grave abuses arising from the ignorance of the labourers and their utter helplessness and inability to protect their interests against the arts of unprincipled recruiters who deceived them by false hopes and delusive promises to enter into contracts, the real nature of which they did not often sufficiently understand. The facts which have subsequently been brought to light and which have from time to time been published in the newspapers confirm the gravest apprehensions that ever were entertained with regard to the working of this part of the law".[6] In support of their contention the Committee quoted the judgment of the Deputy Magistrate of Berhampur in a case where three recruiters were punished with rigorous imprisonment for having enticed a minor girl for employment as coolie without her mother's knowledge and consent. The Committee then refer in detail to the case of Kessur Sing Nepali, a postal peon drawing a monthly salary of Rs. 10. Being assured that one Lachman Sing of Assam could easily secure for him a suitable appointment there on a salary of Rs. 15 or Rs. 20 per month, Kessur and his wife met Lachman at Jalpaiguri, and were taken to Dhubri coolie depot. While on board the steamer Kessur Singh created a commotion by refusing to drink water drawn from the river by the Muhammadan crew. This attracted the notice of a kind-hearted passenger, and when the steamer reached Tezpur he persuaded a local lawyer to institute a suit for their release. Kessur Sing, on solemn affirmation, stated before the Deputy Commissioner of Darrang: "Soon after we were lodged in the depot, a Babu took down our names and gave us a blanket, two *coortas* (shirts) and two *dhotis* and a tin mug. I did not wish to accept these things, but the Jamadar Lutchman Sing said they are given us as present by the Sirdar and returned me the Rs. 5 I had given as my railway fare. We got no other money and this was my own. I never saw any agreement and I never signed any agreement. I can sign my own name. No saheb asked me any question. A saheb came on horse-back to the depot once, but left without saying anything. It was not till I got on board the steamer when the doctor said you must drink here and not there, that I found out I was an emigrant".[7] After making a reference to the Deputy Commissioner, Dhubri, the Deputy Commissioner of Darrang passed the following order: "Read letter 266E, dated 7th August, from the Deputy Commissioner, Dhubri. From the statements contained in this letter it is quite clear Kessur Sing and his wife entered into agreements, and his petition to the effect that he was deceived, cannot be entertained. He must therefore proceed to the garden for which he was recruited".[8] The Committee made the following comment on this order: "Even if it be admitted, that Kessur Sing and his wife had entered into any agreement, it is quite clear that they did so under misrepresentation and were according to law justly entitled to have their contracts cancelled. No man in his senses would have ever resigned a comparatively lucrative and respectable post for the purpose of being employed as a coolie in a tea-garden far away from his home on half his original pay, unless some kind of fraud had been practised upon him. Yet their application was dismissed". The Committee next referred to the cases of three women of respectable classes. Two of these, Ahladi, the daughter of a Brahman, and Shashi, a Boishtam woman, were bathing in the Ganges in Calcutta when the former told the latter that she would very much like to go to a relative's house in Baranagar but did not know where it was located. "Hearing this, some one near them volunteered to show them the place, and another woman corroborated what this man said. Thereupon the volunteer brought a hackney, took Ahladi and Shashi therein, and drove them off. This was at about 10 a.m. After driving from place to place, at last, at about 5 p.m. they were brought into a house where they were confined for some 5 or 6 hours, and afterwards again put into a coach and brought to the Sealdah Station, where, to their utter astonishment, they were locked up in the train, which then left for Goalundo and Dhubri. Breaking their journey now by train and then by steamer, they at last arrived, as they said, at a place (Dhubri) and were taken to some houses where they were thrust into the company of innumerable ragged, half-clad, dirty men, women and children. The next day they were conducted to the river ghaut and filed before a Sahib, and then put on board a steamer which after five days arrived at this place (Dibrugarh). It was on board the steamer that Ahladi and Shashi got acquainted with Deologni, who told them that she was a Rajput, and had two children at her home; one day, quarrelling with some one at home, she, in the heat of anger, came out to the road, where she was accosted by a man who, pretending to console her, put her into the train and conveyed to where God knows. Deologni was in her senses, but always crying for her children, till the second day after they were shipped. when suddenly she became mute and showed signs of insanity. For eleven days they did not eat anything." The correspondent, who heard the story from Ahladi and Shashi—Deolagni having become insane and died—continues: "The tears of these poor women would move the heart of anybody; they would cling round the legs of any one who would kindly ask them their circumstances. Our kind-hearted Deputy Commissioner detained them for some two days till the receipt of their contracts, but when these showed nothing to authorise his interference, they were taken to their destination, the Khobong Garden. in the district".[9]

One might well wonder how such things were possible when the Act of 1882, in the words of Lord Ripon, "takes the utmost possible care that the labourer should thoroughly understand the nature of the engagement he is about to enter into". As this is a very pertinent question and is likely to make many suspect the truth of the above story, though it was reported in several newspapers and never contradicted, the following lengthy extract is quoted from the memorial by way of explanation.

"The law provides that an emigrant should 'understand the contract as regards the locality, period and nature of the service, the rate of wages and the price at which rice is to be supplied to him, that the terms thereof are in accordance with the law, that he has not been induced to agree to enter thereunto by any coercion, undue influence, fraud, misrepresentation, and that he is willing to fulfil the same'. Before a labourer is registered it is therefore necessary that the registering officer should satisfy himself that he understands the drift of his contract as regards the points referred to above. But the manner in which this part of the registering officer's duty is performed precludes the possibility of the terms of the contract being clearly explained to the coolie or being understood by him. Like regiments of soldiers, the coolies are made to stand in groups before the registering officer. When they thus stand in regular lines, one after another, the registering officer begins his examination, and they are examined *en masse.* The questions that are usually put and the answers that are usually given are appended below:

"Questions of the registering officer.

1. Where do you go?
2. For how many years do you go?
3. What work will you do?
4. What will be the rate of your wages?
5. At what price will rice be supplied to you?
6. If the price of the rice be more than three rupees who will pay the difference?

Answers given by the coolies (men and women in one voice).

1. We go to Assam.
2. For five years.
3. Men—We will hoe. Women—We will pick up tea-leaves.
4. Men—Five rupees for the first three years and six rupees for the last two years. Women—Four rupees for the first three years and five rupees for the last two years.
5. At three rupees a maund.
6. The Sirkar (meaning the employer) will pay.

"The enquiry then comes to a close. It is obvious, the Committee submit, that an enquiry conducted in such a fashion and under such conditions must defeat the purpose which the law has in view, *viz.*, to provide the necessary safe-guards for the protection of the coolie. The stereotyped answers given to stereotyped questions by a crowd of ignorant people do not imply that they have really all taken part in the replies that are given, or that even those who have taken part in them have understood their drift. It would be absurd to hold that unless the necessary explanations were forthcoming they would even understand where Assam was—whether it was a Province or a town, or how far distant it was from their homes, or the sort of work which they would have to undergo in the tea-gardens. If the account which they have received regarding the manner in which the contract is explained to the coolies is correct, the Committee have little hesitation in affirming that it is an empty form which is gone through, that while the letter of the law is preserved, its spirit is completely broken, and that the coolies are not much wiser after their being brought before the registering officer than they had been before that event. Indeed the Committee of the Indian Association have been informed that in many cases the coolies, before they are brought before the registering officer, are regularly taught by the officers attached to the depots to return the stereotyped answers to the stereotyped questions which have been quoted above, and that those who in any way prove refractory are either kept back in the depots and there shut up as prisoners till they consent to sign the agreement, or if they are brought before the registering officer they are pushed back towards the rear, so that from behind other people they may not have an opportunity of speaking to him. The Committee are aware that these are grave allegations to make; and they have ventured to put them forward upon the evidence which they have been able to collect by enquiries made in Assam and by their agents, and they hope that the Commission of enquiry which they will have prayed for in this letter will sift this and other matters connected with coolie emigration into Assam and suggest the remedy."[10]

The hope of the Committee was never realized, for in spite of their challenge no commission of inquiry was appointed to inquire into the system of recruiting.

3. *Condition of the Coolies in the Assam Tea-Gardens*

The Deputy Surgeon-General and Sanitary Commissioner of Assam, the highest medical authority in Assam, makes the following observations in his Report of 1884: "The condition of the emigrant labourers alters greatly for the worse immediately he is landed from the river-steamers and discharged from Government sanitary protection. In many important respects he is thenceforward left to his own resources; in others he receives only modified and often injudicious care; in all the conditions of life he is less favourably placed than before. His food is no longer dietetic and carefully cooked; his clothing and bedding (beyond a blanket) is left to himself to provide; his lodging is often inadequate against the variations of climate; his work exposes him to all weathers, and often to dangerous disease-causes; he is unprotected against drinking to excess; nay, he is, in many instances, almost tempted to it; even if he falls ill, the hospital is a name only, he may receive medicine either by daily attendance at a dispensary or given to him in his hut; but the care of suitable food and adequate restoratives and nursing are, generally speaking, unknown. It is no wonder therefore that the rate of sickness and mortality among the tea-garden labourers as a class has been always very great; that in many gardens it is above what is counted a frightful epidemic in civilised countries."[11]

The death-rate, referred to in the Report, was 37.8 per thousand, in 1882, when the new Act for safeguarding the interests of the coolies came into force. It rose to 41.3 in 1883, and 43.2 in 1884, and, according to the Sanitary Commissioner, nothing occurred during 1885 which would induce him to modify his Report quoted above.

The infant mortality was also very high, rising from 39.7 per thousand to 44 per thousand in 1884. "Neglect on the part of the women who are unable to do their daily task and at the same time look after the children and who cannot afford to do no work and stay at home accounts in a great measure for the high mortality among children."[12] So the condition of labour was such that a coolie-woman had to neglect the duties of the mother in order to meet the demands of her employers. The lot of the coolie-child was thus described by the Civil Surgeon of Dibrugarh: "The conditions of child life in a tea-garden are altogether so unfavourable that the wonder is how so many children succeed in passing childhood's stage. A coolie woman gets a variable amount of leave for her confinement. After that if the infant is not strangled at birth, she must either take it out to her work, or leave it behind with no one to look after it. In the former case, tied to its mother's back or left in the nearest drain, it is exposed to the extremes of heat and cold, to wind and rain; in the latter the child gets half-starved and so paves its way to a death from some bowel-disorder or succeeds in cutting short its career by a fall or a roll into the open fire. So alive are coolie women to these facts that to avoid the trouble of bringing up their children under such circumstances, abortion is frequently resorted to, and *dais* (female quacks) who produce it, often find their business a very profitable one". In noticing the excessive mortality among the children he again observes in his report of 1886: "Turning to an actual analysis of the figures, two facts are noticeable, and one more than another. This is the large number of death among the children. Of fifteen reported deaths among the non-Act coolies, fourteen are of children. This is directly traceable to the first of the causes of sickness I have mentioned.

Women are most needed during the plucking season, which is at the same time most sickly. It is not to be wondered at, therefore, that they are not allowed the time they need to look after their children, or that the latter are neglected".[13] This provoked the very just comment of the Committee: "A more revolting and at the same time a more painful admission, it is difficult to conceive....No state of recognized slavery could be worse".[14]

The heavy mortality among the coolies was also largely due to the hard work imposed upon them. "Under Section 115 of the Emigration Act, the schedule of work is framed by the planters themselves, and though subject to revision by the Inspector, the visits of that officer are few and far between, and he can scarcely be expected to exercise any effectual check over the work which the planters in their interests may think fit to allot."[15]

The punishment meted out to the coolies beggars description. The following is an extract from the memorial:

"The cane is too frequently employed in many of the tea gardens in Assam. A high officer of the Assam Government, while on an incognito visit to a garden, saw that the manager having tied the hands of a coolie to a tree was caning him most unmercifully. In 1884 Mr. Francis, Manager of the Dygoroon tea-garden, was tried on a charge of grievous hurt, for having struck a coolie woman with a cane which caused her death. Dr. Conceicao, the Civil Surgeon of Golaghat, who made a post-mortem examination said that 'death was the result of congestion of the kidneys, which he was of opinion had been set up by violence applied to that part of the body where the kidneys are situated'. But Francis called a witness to show that he did not strike the woman, but only lifted his cane and threatened to strike her. Francis was eventually acquitted.

"The next mode of punishment which is sometimes resorted to is the lock-up. The Committee have been given to understand that it is the fermenting-house which is generally used for the purpose. In 1884 two officers of the Dum-Duma tea-estate in the District of Dibrugarh named Babus Kedar Nath Ghosh and Sasadhar Barua were charged with the offence of keeping a man under illegal restraint, and in this case the existence of dungeon in many tea-gardens was proved by the witnesses for the defence. The Assistant Commissioner Mr. Greenshield who tried the case expressed in his judgment great surprise and strong disapproval of such conduct on part of the planters.

"In December 1886, the following telegram appeared in the newspapers which goes to support the view which the Committee have here put forward:—

'Having been systematically maltreated, some 110 coolies, men and women, came in a body on the 9th instant from the Rajabarie tea-garden, and made complaint before the Assistant Commissioner, Mr. McLeod, who immediately sent out Lieutenant Gordon to the garden, and asked him to report about the coolies' complaints. Lieutenant Gordon has found some of the serious charges to be correct, namely, the existence of a dungeon, where absconders and other recalcitrant coolies are confined and tied down with ropes. The Manager, Mr. Eyre, admitted having the dungeon, and having cut a coolie with a cane".[16]

Reference has been made above[17] to the statement of Sir Bampfylde Fuller, Chief Commissioner of Assam, that "on some gardens there was a good deal of flogging", and also to two actual cases cited by him, in one of which a woman was stripped and flogged and in another a coolie was killed as a result of flogging with a stirrup leather. The first case is very important. The penalty—fine amounting to a month's salary—inflicted for such a heinous crime, at the suggestion of the Chief Commissioner, and maintained by the High Court judge, an Englishman, shows the little value that even highest British officials put on the honour of Indian women. After this it would be difficult to refuse credence to the stories of outrage on coolie women by the officials of the gardens. These stories, repeated in newspapers and widely circulated from various reliable sources, seem to indicate that such outrages were taken to be the normal lot of every coolie woman. As in the case of indigo-planters, it is difficult to prove such cases, but the probability in the case of tea-planters is much greater, as the temptation and opportunities of committing the crime were much greater.

The Committee pointed out in detail how the provisions of the Act of 1882, framed for the special protection of the coolies, were systematically violated or not given effect to, and in some respects it was done with the full concurrence of the authorities in Assam. This was true with regard to two very important safeguards, namely, the prompt registration of a contract and its verification provided in section 111 of the Act of 1882. The Committee made the following comment on the subject:

"'It will thus be seen that a provision of the law which by ensuring prompt registration of contracts affords some sort of protection to the coolie is rendered nugatory by the manner of its application which again is contrary to law. Then with regard to that part of Section 111 which requires that contracts should be verified, the Chief Commissioner observes in the Emigration Report for 1883, that 'the number verified is extremely disproportionate to the number registered, and it seems that only in Cacher and Sibsagar have any strenuous efforts been made to perform this important duty'. The duty of verification is not only not regularly but also not properly performed. The Chief Commissioner in the report for the year 1883 admits that 'It is in itself a much more satisfactory thing that the terms of the engagement should be explained to the coolie, before he signs it, by an officer of Government. But this is not always possible.'

"Out of 25,457 local contracts executed in 1884, only 9,492 were verified during the year, and out of the number, 117 contracts were cancelled 'as a punishment on managers for transgressing the rules.' That the provisions of Section 111 of the Act operate to the injury of the coolie is a fact which is admitted by high official authority. Thus in 1883, Mr. Porteus, the sub-divisional officer of Karimgunge, wrote:—

'There is not the smallest security that the coolie, when he is brought up to go through the form of touching the pen, in company with some dozens of others at the garden, understands in the least what he is signing to. There is no provision that his agreement should be first explained to him, nor is it very likely that any objection he might make would be listened to. He is expected to sign with the rest. As shown above, it is not uncommon for coolies to try to repudiate their agreements afterwards, and it is very difficult to decide whether their objections afford sufficient ground for cancellation.'

"Mr. Stevens, the Deputy Commissioner of Sylhet, endorsed these remarks. He said:

'In the above remarks of the sub-divisional officer of Karimgunge on the liability of abuse of the Section 111 procedure I fully concur. In this matter the law appears entirely one-sided. Every thing is in favour of the employer. A labour contract, purporting to have been signed by the coolie, but either not executed by him or if executed, executed under a misapprehension, is sent in for registration under Section 111 and is registered. It may not be verified for a year afterwards; and suppose it is then cancelled, what compensation does the unfortunate coolie receive? He has been, one may say, in wrongful confinement for a year, forced to labour for a year, forced to labour for a master who had no claim to his services and liable, if he tried to escape from his state of quasi-slavery, to be pursued, arrested, and sent up for trial like a common criminal, or worse, as these even cannot in all cases be arrested without a warrant".[18] It is important to note that the Deputy Commissioner describes the status of a coolie as one of quasi-slavery.

The following statement made by a garden-manager, Gibbons, before the Inspecting Officer is most revealing:—"Several coolies' agreements were written out on the first December last. They were written by Gopal Chandra. They were signed by me. They were not signed by the coolies on the first December. I did not bring up the coolies to my bungalow on the first December. They never executed the agreements now placed before me. I however sent them in to be registered." In reply to an exclamation of surprise on the part of Mr. Lyon, the Inspecting Officer, at this statement, Gibbons said that there was nothing extraordinary in this—that it was the custom and was always done. The High Court in reviewing this case observed:

> "It is difficult to conceive a grosser case. The helplessness and ignorance of the labourers and the superior intelligence and position of the accused aggravates the offence which but for the intervention of the Inspector would have entailed grievous injustice on the labourers."[19]

The Committee observed with regret that "in cases between planters and coolies, too often the interests of justice and the interests of the weaker party are not sufficiently cared for." This may be regretted but need hardly cause any surprise after what has been said above regarding the attitude of the English officers towards their fellow-countrymen, the indigo-planters.[20] The same reason operated with the same effect. The Committee described several instances in detail, but two may be briefly cited. "On the 10th of October, 1885, one Sheikh Sukari petitioned the Magistrate of Sibsagar for a discharge certificate under section 141 of Act I for the release of his son Sheikh Khodadin from the garden of one Mr. Hosack of Diron tea-estate. The Assistant Commissioner, Lieut. H. R. Browne, who was the trying Magistrate, wrote a letter to Mr. Hosack giving him the substance of the application and calling upon him to make his defence. But Mr. Hosack, without sending him a reply, wrote to the Deputy Commissioner". He complained against Mr. Browne, stated that Sheikh Khodadin was not a coolie but his domestic servant, and finally requested the Deputy Commissioner to oblige him by looking into the case.

"On receipt of this letter, the application of the father was summarily dismissed on the 28th October without even calling for evidence". But Khodadin, having managed to escape from the garden and "applied on the 2nd November to Lt. Browne to grant him a discharge certificate, the same day the following order was passed:—

'Mr. Hosack has already written to say that complainant has no contract; complainant is told that he can leave the employ if he wishes to.'

"But on the next day, the 3rd November, one Pator Gogoi on behalf of Mr. Hosack made an application under Section 175 to Lt. Browne for the arrest of Sheikh Khodadin on a charge of desertion. A warrant was immediately issued, and the man having been arrested was put on his trial the same day and was summarily convicted to undergo a sentence of seven days' rigorous imprisonment; it appears from the judgment that if Mr. Hosack had not asked for the accused 'to be lightly treated,' he would have been more severely punished...The judge forgot that this sentence passed on the accused completely upset his order of the previous day. It was he who had told the accused 'that he can leave the employ if he wishes to,' and the next day he upsets the order on the strength of a document whose existence Mr. Hosack himself was not aware of!

"In another case a coolie, Bhola Kachari by name, was convicted by Mr. Arbuthnot, the Assistant Commissioner of Jorhat, although the contract was not drawn up in conformity with the requirements of Section 9, Clause C of Act I of 1882 and its schedule, and of Section 111 as to registration. The High Court in setting aside the conviction observed:—'It appears to the judges that owing to Mr. Arbuthnot's mistake the accused in this case has undergone several months' imprisonment for which there were no legal grounds'. The learned Judges, Justices Cunningham and Chandra Madhab Ghose, called for an explanation from Mr. Arbuthnot."[21] Reference may be made in this connection to the two cases mentioned above, of failure of justice and executive interference in judicial affairs noted by Sir Bamfylde Fuller, the Chief Commissioner of Assam.[22]

The memorial of the Indian Association ended with a prayer for inquiry couched in the following words:—

"The Committee of the Indian Association have now submitted their representation; and they venture to hope that they have made it clear that the system by which coolies are recruited, their treatment in the tea-gardens, and the imperfect nature of the protection afforded them by the Act are such as should engage the earnest attention of the Government. The coolies themselves are voiceless; they have no organization to represent them. All the more, therefore, the Committee submit, is the duty incumbent upon the Government to look to their grievances and to redress them. The Committee would earnestly appeal to the Government for the appointment of an independent Commission to enquire into the facts which have been here urged and generally into the condition of the coolies in the Assam tea-gardens. A thorough and exhaustive inquiry is all that the Committee seek for as the basis for any future action which the Government may think fit to take, and the Committee earnestly hope that the Government will have no difficulty in complying with this request. The Committee have learnt with satisfaction that His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal has appointed a special officer to enquire into certain complaints of kidnapping and other criminal offences made by persons engaged in free recruiting outside the provisions of Act I of 1882. No enquiry, however, into the working of Act I of 1882 and Act XIII of 1859 has yet been ordered, and the necessity for it clearly exists in view of the evidence which has been set forth in this letter and indeed of the action of Government of Bengal itself."[23] To this the Government vouchsafed the following reply. "The Government of India, in communication with the Chief Commissioner of Assam, is taking measures for a full enquiry into the practical working of the emigration system in Assam with a view to introducing such amendments as may be found necessary. The reconsideration of the existing rules and regulations in the light of the practical experience gained was fixed, some time ago, for January, 1890, and meanwhile the points raised in the letter of the Indian Association will be carefully investigated".[24]

But the Indians outside Bengal also had not much more sympathy for the coolies. Attempts were made to discuss the subject in the Indian National Congress, both in 1887 and 1888. But on both occasions the proposal was turned down on the ground that the subject was 'provincial' rather than 'national'. This indicates the general apathy on the subject, outside Bengal. It is said that this refusal on the part of the Indian National Congress induced the Bengal leaders to call a Provincial Conference. It was first convened mainly for the discussion of the coolie question, but became a regular annual institution. The Conference passed the following resolution:

"The Conference is of opinion that it has become essential alike in the interests of the coolies, and for the credit of the Government, to appoint an independent Commission to enquire into the condition of the coolies in the tea-gardens in Assam, and the general working of Act XIII of 1859 and Act I of 1882".[25]

The Government, however, never appointed such a commission. Perhaps the revelations made by the Commission on Indigo-plantation served as a warning. But the 'ruptured spleen' of Assam coolies became a bye-word of reproach to the tea-planters as well as to the Government.

4. *Brutality of the Tea-planters admitted by the highest British officials*

The brutal outrages committed with impunity by the European planters upon the helpless Indian coolies are so incredible that it seems necessary to quote some official correspondence on the subject in order to depict their true nature. The following extracts from letters[26] would convey some idea of the tragic situation, though the actual state of things was much worse than such official admission.

a. General Review.

Curzon to Hamilton, 5 August, 1903

"Fuller has now returned to Assam.....I also propose to address him about relations between tea-planters and their coolies in his Province, which seem to me to be entering upon a more acute and dangerous phase. The coolies are learning to combine, and very often, upon any provocation, they are apt to gather together and assault the European manager of the plantation. These managers are drawn from a most inferior class of Englishmen and Scotchmen; they do not know the language, they have a profound contempt for the Natives and they are sometimes guilty of serious acts of lust and oppression. The planters actually allege in public meetings that they can be certain of no justice, though what they mean by this is that they regard it as the greatest of hardships if a planter is fined Rs. 100/- for an assault that terminates in the death of a coolie, while the coolie gets a term of rigorous imprisonment of from three to six years if he so much as lifts his hands against a European. In my view this unfortunate state of affairs is likely to continue, and even to develop as long as the present Labour Law remains in Assam. The Labour Law is really a penal contract, and *the coolies may almost be described as slaves.* They cannot run away except at the cost of being arrested and thrown into prison. As long as these conditions exist, the masters will continue to bully their slaves, and the slaves will resent the tyranny of the masters. Some day we shall abolish the penal contract altogether, and the planters will have to go to the open market for their labour. A good many concerns will smash altogether and disappear from view, but the stronger and better-managed gardens will survive, and the planters will then have to treat their coolies with humanity, because otherwise they will not be able to retain them at all."

b. Miscarriage of Justice.

1. *Curzon to Hamilton, 17 October, 1900*

"I have discussed with you, in many letters, the difficulties that have to be encountered in this country in the endeavour to secure even justice as between Europeans and natives in the Courts. I have shown you successively how Magistrates, District Judges, Juries and Court-martials all fail, when it is a question of sentencing a European for an injury to a native. I am sorry now to have to report that even the High Court of Calcutta is not exempt. There occurred, recently in Assam, a case of the most gross and aggravated assault by an Englishman in a tea plantation upon one of his coolies. The district magistrate who tried it sentenced the culprit to a fine of Rs. 50/-. The Local Government in great anger at this utterly inadequate sentence took the case to the High Court, on a motion for enhancement. The two Judges who tried the case rejected the appeal on the flimsiest grounds, which could scarcely impose upon anyone. One of their number was the individual before whom was recently tried at Calcutta the soldier who successfully feigned madness in order to escape the consequences of his murderous deed."

2. *Curzon to Hamilton, 24 July, 1901*

"Much the same is true also of Assam. I have had three cases before me during the past weeks in which the English Magistrates, who are entirely in the hands of tea-planters, have given the most partial and unjust sentences in cases between the planters or managers of the tea gardens and their coolies. If a coolie threatens, or commits a technical assault upon an Englishman, he is given a year's rigorous imprisonment. The Englishman may thrash a coolie almost to death, or may criminally assault his daughter or wife, and he only gets a fine of Rs. 50/-. Now I learn it is the fashion for the Magistrates, when a case of this character comes before him, to send out to the tea-planters for their opinion, and if this be unfavourable to action, a great many of the cases are burked altogether. Cotton interns himself in his office, and writes long letters and resolutions, but knows next to nothing of his officers or of his people. The administration has therefore become very feeble in his hands, and will want a good deal of bracing up when he goes."

II. OUTSIDE INDIA

I. *The Indenture System*

The Industrial Revolution and the development of large-scale production in Europe had a great repercussion on those European countries which had colonies in various parts of the world. They had vast territories and capital, but their man-power was not sufficient to exploit the material resources of the colonies to the fullest extent. They at first used slave labour, but the abolition of slavery in the British empire in 1833 raised a great problem. Sufficient native labour was not available for the developing plantations, and the substitution of white labour was out of the question, because of the unsuitable climate and heavy expenditure involved. It was this predicament that forced the European planters and colonial governments to turn to India for the supply of labour.

The ruin of industry in India, brought about by the British rule and the Industrial Revolution in Britain, had rendered millions of Indian workers in various arts and crafts destitute without any means of earning livelihood. The poverty of the cultivators was increased by the heavy land tax. The cumulative effect of these and other factors was seen in the recurring famines during the 18th and 19th centuries. "It was in such a predicament that the planters from foreign countries approached the Indian Government through the imperial and colonial governments for a steady and continuous supply of Indian labour. The earnest entreaties and the rosy promises held out by the colonial planters and governments at a most psychological moment proved decisive. And organized emigration of Indian labour to the British colonies began from Bengal in 1838 under the supervision and direction of the Government of India. The active sympathy of the Government of India accelerated the pace of emigration. The colonial governments appointed professional recruiters who visited Indian villages stricken with failure of crops, or pilgrim centres during days of huge religious congregations, and entrapped poor Indians by dangling before them hopeful pictures of prospects in the colonies. They fulfilled the legal formalities with official connivance of the recruiting depots and then took them over for indentured service. With the success of the British planters, the other colonial planters also became interested in Indian labour. Indian emigration was later extended to the French and the Dutch colonies."[27]

The heavy cost involved in recruiting and transporting labourers across the seas to distant colonies led the planters to devise the indenture system which practically chained the labourer to the employer. "The chief features of this system were five years of State regulated labour, denial of the right to change the employer or employment, and the denial of increased wages in spite of increased prices and profits. The employer was under a legal obligation to provide fixed wages, free housing, medical attendance and other amenities." But the planters adopted all means, fair or foul, to prevent the Indian emigrants from returning home.

Many colonies such as Jamaica, Trinidad, British Guiana, and Fiji had regular recruiting agents in India who adopted most fraudulent practices for inducing the Indians to sign the contract, and in many cases men and women were enticed by deceit or falsehood, and even abducted by force. The mode of transportation was horrible. They were herded together like Negro slaves of the eighteenth century without any proper arrangement for food and sanitation. and a large percentage died on the way. Those who survived had to work under a vicious system and were subjected to fines, floggings and imprisonment. Many labourers went mad or committed suicide. There were also grave moral evils, mainly due to the housing of Indian labour. Andrews and Pearson who personally visited the coolie lines of Fiji stated that these were mostly responsible for prostitution and immorality among the Indian immigrants. Tyson reported that in Jamaica the housing, with a few exceptions, was deplorable. The Royal Commission of 1897 made a scathing criticism of the housing of Indian labour in Trinidad. There was no change in the wages in British Guiana between 1871 and 1922, in Trinidad between 1845 and 1920, and it remained constant for 40 to 50 years in many other places.[28]

It would be hardly an exaggeration to say that the indenture system suffered from almost all the evils of slavery with the only change that Indian subjects of Britain were substituted for Negroes of Africa. Sir William Hunter stated that the indenture system was perilously near slavery. Gokhale and Gandhi described it as 'semi-slavery'. Lord Olivier said: "It is notable that the West Indian Negro thinks the *coolie* (i.e., the Indian labourer) more of a slave than we do."[29]

2. *The Island of Mauritius*[30]

A typical example is furnished by Mauritius, an island in the Indian Ocean, 550 miles east of Madagascar. Known as *Ile de France*, while in French possession, it passed into the hands of the British during the Napoleonic War, and became a crown colony. But it was a colony of slaves, having 87,000 slaves in 1815, and 76,000 in 1835, when the slaves were officially emancipated in Mauritius. It was the first British colony to import free labourers on a large scale from India. The system began in 1830, and by 1838 there were 24,000 Indian labourers in Mauritius. These immigrants suffered terribly during the journey and fared no better when they landed. The planters of Mauritius, being long accustomed to coercive methods applied to the slaves, treated the Indian labourers also in the same manner. They had no idea that Sunday work, unlimited hours and corporal punishments were illegal. The Government of

Mauritius legalised such conduct by passing Ordinances 16 and 17 of 1835. They were so brutal that even the British Government vetoed them on the ground that they established a system of slavery.

The agitation in the Calcutta Press and the reports of their own officers induced the Government of India to pass the Act V of 1837, which, supplemented by the Act XXXII of 1837, regulated the recruitment of Indian labourers for Mauritius. These two Acts may be said to have formulated the system of Indenture whose main features have been described above. The evils of this system were exposed by scathing criticism, even in the British Parliament, in 1837-8, and Lord Brougham referred to the iniquitous measure as having given legal sanction to a future slave trade. There was also strong agitation in Calcutta, and at a public meeting in the Town Hall, held on 10 July, 1838, the prevailing malpractices in the export of coolies from Calcutta were strongly condemned. The Government of India suspended emigration from India to Mauritius. British Guiana, and other places with effect from 11 July, 1838, and appointed a committee to go into the matter. This Committee of six—one Indian and five Englishmen—were not unanimous in their recommendations. Two Englishmen and the solitary Indian submitted the majority report with two dissentient notes, the sixth member having left India before the Committee could complete the work. According to the majority report the "coolies were generally induced to come to Calcutta by fraud and deceit, practised upon them by subordinate agents employed by Europeans and Anglo-Indians, who were mostly aware of the frauds. In many instances the coolie was incapable of understanding his contract. Kidnapping had prevailed to a very great extent, the coolies, while kept in Calcutta itself and its neighbourhood. being actually in a state of close imprisonment." As a result of this Report the emigration of labourers from India, suspended in 1838, was prohibited in 1840 by the Government of India, and the British Parliament ratified the decision.

This spelt utter disaster to the planters, traders, and merchants of Mauritius who sent a joint petition against the prohibition to the British authorities in London. The expected result followed. The Government of India, under pressure of the Colonial Office and the Board of Control, passed the Act XV of 1842, permitting emigration of labourers from Calcutta, Bombay and Madras, the ostensible justification of this volte-face being furnished by the promises, on the part of the Mauritius Government, of better conduct in future, followed by an ordinance which, however, did not abate by a jot the sufferings of the Indian indentured labourers.

Far from effecting any improvement, the authorities made the position of the labourers much worse by Ordinance XXII of 1847 which imposed new hardships upon them. Under this Ordinance it was no longer binding upon the employers to provide residence for the labourers; monthly wages of certain categories were reduced to four shillings; absence without leave was punished by forfeiture of wages and rations; and penalties, including imprisonment, were prescribed for various other offences.

The death of 284 out of 697 labourers, due to gross negligence during the voyage to Mauritius, led the Government of India to suspend for a short time the emigration of labourers in 1856 and to pass the Act XIII of 1864, incorporating therein the existing laws—19 in all—and adding several measures to improve the lot of labourers. But though it partially removed some of the malpractices at the time of making contracts, it did not improve the condition of the Indian labourers in Mauritius. There was an officer with the pompous name of the 'Protector of Immigrants'. But, as the Governor of Mauritius admitted in 1860, that officer was more a colonial agent than a protector. The immigrants were actually subjected to severe ill-treatment by the Protection Department. "On numerous occasions when they had to sleep overnight in the depot of the Immigration Department, they were beaten and pushed out on the road." On one occasion Joseph, a clerk, made a labourer, whose replies to his queries did not satisfy him, stand with a large register placed on his head while his peon "gave the labourer a few smart lashes with a cane". A report of this incident in a local daily was turned down with ridicule by the authorities, but the 'Protector' had to admit its truth before the Royal Commission.

The Act XIII of 1864, and the Ordinance XXXI of 1867 passed by the Government of Mauritius, effected some improvements in the position and "lifted the indentured labourers at least theoretically from the slough of slavery." But the benefits derived from them were more than counterbalanced by a number of reactionary laws which followed them.

A labourer found little relief even after the period of contract was over. If he refused to work for the planters and tried to earn his living independently, he was treated rather like a convict. He had to take a license and wear a badge on his arm, and was fined for failure to do either. £ 20,000 were realised in fees and fines from this class of persons between 1867 and 1872. Many vexatious laws—almost brutal in some cases—were rendered still more brutal by the way in which they were applied by an "unsympathetic police and a no more sympathetic magistracy". In 1869 more than 30,000 persons were arrested for failure to produce on demand any of the various documents they were liable to carry with them. Of these 7,000 were released as they were illegally arrested, more than 11,000 received light punishments, while more than 12,000 were sentenced to various terms of imprisonment. These had the desired effect, namely, to force the indenture-expired Indian labourers to re-indenture. The Government of India denounced the oppressive laws, and a Royal Commission was appointed in 1872 to inquire into the matter. The Commission admitted the complaints and allegations to be substantially true, and regarded the condition of immigrant labour as deplorable. But the British colonial office felt greater sympathy for the perpetrators of the brutal acts noted by the Commission than for those who were their victims. For, the former belonged to the white ruling race, and the latter, to the black subject-race. As in the cases of the indigo-planters and tea-planters in India, so in Mauritius and other colonies, weak and helpless Indian labourers were at the absolute mercy of the white planters, who knew that they could commit the worst outrages on their labourers with impunity, or with a nominal punishment. In India the planters were backed by the Government and European Police and Magistrates, while in Mauritius and other colonies the planters were backed by the Colonial Office in London.

A somewhat detailed account has been given of the lot of Indian labourers in Mauritius, because it was not an isolated case but typical of what took place in other colonies.

It is a sad commentary on the economic condition of the masses in India under British rule that, in spite of such horrible conditions, more and more labourers from India immigrated into Mauritius and other colonies. This illustrates, as nothing else could, the extreme poverty of the Indian people, and the apathy of the British rulers to their welfare when it came into conflict with the interest of the British planters. What this interest amounted to was very briefly indicated by Jackson, the Colonial Governor, when he said in 1935: "Mauritius owes much to the Indians. More than two-thirds of the people of Mauritius are of Indian descent and it is their presence in the colony which has made possible the intensive development, which places Mauritius among the most highly productive areas in the (British) Empire."

In support of the above statements we may quote the following figures to indicate the rapid increase in the number of immigrants in Mauritius:

Year	Total Population (in thousands)	Number of Indians (in thousands)
1846	158	56
1851	180	77
1861	310	192
1881	359	248
1891	370	255
1901	371	259

3. *The Indians In South Africa*[31]

The Indians in South Africa fell under two broad categories, namely, (i) Indentured labourers; (ii) Free, unindentured Indians.

Indians were first imported into South Africa in 1860 as indentured labourers to till the British-owned sugar, tea and coffee plantations. They came as serfs under a contract for five years. A large number of labourers, however, chose to remain in South Africa even after the contract was over. But a law, passed in Natal in 1894, compelled these indentured labourers to return to India or renew their indenture. An Act of 1895 permitted an ex-indentured labourer to remain in South Africa on payment of an annual tax of three pounds for himself and each of his dependants. But few could meet this exorbitant demand.

Free immigrants from India also visited South Africa. They earned their livelihood as hawkers, tradesmen and artisans, and followed various other professions. In some Colonies, as in Natal, there were free Indians of this class, including ex-indentured labourers, as well as indentured labourers. But in the Transvaal there were no indentured Indian labourers. The Indians went there as free citizens of Her Majesty's Empire to trade in the Colony. But these Indians, being frugal in food, dress, and habits, could undersell the European traders who, being jealous and afraid of their competition, tried to keep them down by unfair means. The process began in Transvaal, chiefly at the instigation of the British merchants, though the Dutch—the Boers—controlled the administration.

The British had annexed the Transvaal in 1877, but the Boers rose in rebellion in 1881 and routed a small British force which had occupied the Majuba Hill. The British thereupon came to terms with the Transvaal Government and these were elaborated in a Convention signed at Pretoria, the capital of the Transvaal, in August 1881. By this instrument the Transvaal was granted self-government subject to British suzerainty.

The clause 26 of the Pretoria Convention guaranteed full rights of citizenship to "all persons other than natives". Whether these 'persons' included Indians might have been in doubt, for there were no Indians in the Transvaal in 1881. They settled there in large number between 1881 and 1886. In 1884 the British and the Transvaal Governments signed a convention at London. Article XIV of the Convention reaffirmed the contents of clause 26 of the Pretoria Convention as follows:

> "All persons, other than natives, conforming themselves to the laws of the South African Republic (a) will have full liberty, with their families, to enter, travel or reside in any part of the South African Republic; (b) they will be entitled to hire or possess houses, manufactories, ware-houses, shops and premises; (c) they may carry on their commerce either in person or by any agents whom they may think fit to employ; (d) they will not be subject, in respect of their persons or property, or in respect of their commerce or industry, to any taxes, whether general or local, other than those which are or may be imposed upon citizens of the said Republic".

As many Indians were then living in the Transvaal, their rights of citizenship were thus fully protected by the Convention of London. In fact, the early Indians actually enjoyed this protection; their presence and freedom were not objected to, as they stepped on the soil of the Transvaal, or established themselves there, as traders.

Shortly there commenced an agitation against the Indian and other Asiatic settlers who were mostly store-keepers, and the British merchants sent petitions to the Transvaal Government against them. Another petition was sent by the merchants of European descent with a suggestion to stop the immigration of the Asiatics, including the Indians, as these, in the opinion of the petitioners, were not covered by the Article XIV of the London Convention.

The Transvaal Government was fully sympathetic to the petitioners but was doubtful about the interpretation put upon section XIV by them. So its Secretary sent a full report to Lord Derby, the Colonial Secretary of the Home Government, on 6 January, 1885, and asked his opinion on the question. "I beg to request", said he, "that your Lordship will be so good as to acquaint this Government as to the views of Her Majesty's Government on the subject, that is, whether according to the opinion of Her Majesty's Government, this Government is at liberty, under the Convention now in force, to frame such regulations relative to the coloured persons referred to as may appear to them to be in the interests of the inhabitants of this

Republic, and if not, whether Her Majesty's Government by its consent will empower this Government to meet either entirely or partly the wishes of the petitioners of European descent".

Sir Hercules Robinson, the British High Commissioner in the Transvaal, forwarded the letter of the Transvaal Government to the Colonial Secretary with the following observation:

> "As it was doubtless not the intention of Lord Kimberley to prohibit the Transvaal Government from adopting, if necessary, special legislation for the regulation of Indian or Chinese coolie immigrants, I should be disposed to recommend that the Government of the South African Republic be informed that Her Majesty's Government will be willing to amend Article 14 of the Convention...(so as to read) as follows: *All persons other than African natives or Indian or Chinese coolie immigrants conforming themselves to the law of the South African Republic will have full liberty with their families to enter, travel, or reside, etc., etc.,*"

The Earl of Derby agreed with the recommendation of Sir Hercules Robinson and intimated his consent to be communicated to the Transvaal Government as follows:

> "I have carefully considered your suggestion as to the amendment of the Convention, and, if you are of opinion that it would be preferable and more satisfactory to the Government of South African Republic to proceed as you propose, Her Majesty's Government will be willing to amend the Convention as suggested. It seems to deserve consideration, however, whether it would not be more correct for the *Volksraad* to legislate in the proposed sense, having received an assurance that Her Majesty's Government will not desire to insist upon any such construction of the terms of the Convention as would interfere with reasonable legislation in the desired direction".

Sir Hercules Robinson communicated the above to the Transvaal Government in a letter dated 17 April, 1885. It led to the enactment of Law No. 3, 1885, on 10 June, 1885. The main provisions of the Act were as follows:

(1) The Act applied to the persons belonging to one of the aboriginal races of Asia, among whom "the so-called coolies. Arabs, Malayas and Mohammedan subjects of the Turkish empire" were included.

(2) Persons falling in these classes were subjected to various disabilities. They could not acquire the rights of citizenship and could not be owners of landed property. Besides, those who settled

in the Republic for trade, or otherwise, must be registered within eight days of their arrival on payment of twenty-five pounds sterling. Non-registration was declared to be a penal offence.

(3) The Government would have the right to point out proper streets, wards and locations to persons falling in this category for purposes of residence.

After the passing of the Act, Chamberlain, the British Colonial Secretary, made a protest on 24 February, 1886, to the Transvaal Government and asked for its revision, "as it is in direct opposition to the views of Her Majesty's Government, and in its present form is a contravention of the Convention of London".

The Government of the Transvaal now modified their stand and justified the measure on the ground of sanitary considerations in a despatch dated 6 September, 1886. This was, of course, a subterfuge, but they made slight amendments to the Act in that light.

This amendment made two major concessions: the registration fee was reduced from £. 25 to £. 3 and the Indians were allowed to acquire fixed property within the areas set apart for their residence by the Government. But "the Government required certain Indian merchants not only to live but also to conduct their business in the prescribed locations. Licences were not issued to trade outside the locations. Thus *'habitation'* was extended to include *'trade'* also". The British Colonial Secretary protested against it and wrote as follows: "The right of residing, trading, etc., under the London Convention appears to be restricted, as regards Asiatics, by the law of 1885, amended in 1886, by requiring residence in certain localities selected for sanitary reasons and by registration, but not otherwise, and if trading licences are granted to other persons on application, Indian traders have clearly a right to obtain them. Moreover, the law only prescribes locations for *'habitation'* and there does not appear to be any prohibition as to *'trading'*, in places other than locations". But, as before, the Transvaal Government triumphed, and it was decided "that all Asiatics and other persons coming under the said law shall have to limit themselves, both in respect to residence as well as to trade, to the localities appointed".

Though the Acts were passed ostensibly on grounds of health, it was too thin a disguise to deceive anybody. In this connection reference may be made to the following statement of Dr. Krause on behalf of the Transvaal British Association before Asiatic Enquiry Commission on Friday, 16 April, 1920:

"The painful question of Indian undesirability and trade jealousy was initiated as far back as 1886 by several chambers of commerce. It is interesting to note that in a discussion in the *Volksraad* of 1886 arising out of a petition presented by a number of white tradesmen to oust the Indians from Johannesburg a statement was recorded to the effect that 'the European store-keepers charged poor people very high prices for the staff of life, while the coolies charged much less.' Following upon the petition a deputation of white store-keepers waited upon the late President Kruger to urge him to enforce the petition and to do away with the Indian hawkers. The President flatly refused to listen to any such suggestions on the ground that hawkers were 'very useful' to his people.

"....Having failed in this attempt, the white traders, small store-keepers principally, supported another petition with the plea that the Indian was likely to spread leprosy, syphilis and similar loathsome diseases which the white community owing to the presence of the Asiatics were likely to contract. As against this, two counter-petitions were presented to the President, one signed by 1340 Europeans including a large percentage of European wholesale firms declaring that the sanitary habits of the Indian traders and those who resided in Johannesburg and other principal towns, were not inferior to those of the European and that the agitation was due purely to trade jealousy.... Having failed in this, the Indians' rivals then adopted the plea of unfair competition."

There were other restrictions imposed by law on Indians. These may be summed up as follows:

"Firstly, on entering the South African Republic, Indians were required to pay a licence fee of £. 3 and this exempted them from any other special tax, while they were domiciled in the State.

"Secondly, hawkers had to take out a licence of 10 sh. every month. This was not a special tax on Indians as hawkers of all nationalities had to pay this.

"Thirdly, Indians and other Asiatics were not allowed to be out after 5 p.m. without a pass. In the beginning there was no such regulation against Indians. The rule was introduced and consecrated by custom so far as the Natives of South Africa were concerned, and was presumably extended by analogy to the representatives of the coloured races of other countries. In June, 1888, certain Indians in Johannesburg presented a memorial to the *Volksraad* asking to be exempted from the operation of this rule, but their request was not granted.

"Fourthly, the railway regulations prevented Indians from travelling in first or second class. 'Classed as coloured persons, Indians were not allowed to walk on side paths, though there was no specific restriction to this effect in their name'. The Indian traders protested against these restrictions early in 1898 and thereupon the State Secretary of the Transvaal Government gave an assurance to the effect that Indian traders of the better class would not be interfered with and thus the Transvaal Government agreed only to apply their various regulations to the poor class of Indians.

"Lastly, section 92 of the Gold Law No. 15 of 1898 imposed additional restrictions on the occupation of proclaimed land by Asiatics. Under this Act a white man alone could acquire a leasehold right in a stand. He was prohibited from transferring or subletting the leasehold right to a coloured person or permitting such person to reside on or occupy ground held under such right. It was further provided that in the mining district of Witwatersrand no coloured person should be permitted to reside on proclaimed land except in bazars, locations, mining compounds and such other places as the Mining Commissioner might set apart.

"No coloured person (including Indian) may be a licence holder, or in any way be connected with the working of the diggings, but shall be allowed only as a workman in the service of whites".

"The effect of the foregoing clauses was to make illegal in future the leasing of stands for occupation by people from Asia in the mining districts even for purposes of trade except in specified locations or bazars". Thus the Transvaal Government would tolerate Indians as labourers but not as free traders.

This painful episode of the Indians in the Transvaal may be fittingly closed with the following observations of Lord Lansdowne: "A considerable number of the Queen's Indian subjects are to be found in the Transvaal, and among the many misdeeds of the South African Republic, I do not know that any filled me with more indignation than its treatment of these Indians. And the harm is not confined to the sufferers on the spot; for what do you imagine to be the effect produced in India, when these poor people return to their country and report to their friends that the Government of the Empress, so mighty and irresistible in India with its population of 300,000,000, is powerless to secure redress at the hands of a small South African state."

But the Transvaal did not stand alone. Soon Natal followed suit. Here, too, the Europeans viewed with alarm the rapid growth of the Indian population about 1890. An Act of 1895 imposed an annual tax on Indian labourers who refused to reindenture after the first contract was over. The Act No. 8 of 1896 deprived the Indians of the right to vote for Parliamentary elections.

An Indian Immigration Restriction Act was passed in 1897. A second Act with the same title was passed in 1903 which, among other things, permitted the exclusion of all would-be immigrants unable to write in any European alphabets. Under this Act thousands of Asiatics were refused permission to land. Thus Natal did in a series of Acts what the Transvaal had done in 1885 by a single Act, and deprived the Indians of "political, vocational and property rights together with freedom of movement". But Natal did something more. It sought to stop the immigration of Indians and took various oppressive measures against the Indians to which reference will be made in the next volume.

It is interesting to recall in this connection that it was at the earnest request of the white settlers of Natal that the Governor of the Cape had arranged for the importation of Indian labourers, and the first batch of these landed on 17 November, 1860. What these Indians did for Natal was described by Sir Liege Hulett in the Legislative Assembly of Natal in July, 1908, in the following words:

"The condition of the Colony before the importation of Indian labour was one of gloom; it was one that then and there threatened to extinguish the vitality of the country; and it was only by the Government assisting the importation of labour that the country began at once to thrive. The Coast had been turned to one of the most prosperous parts of South Africa. They could not find in the whole of the Cape and the Transvaal what could be found in the Coast of Natal—10,000 acres of land in plot and in crop—and that was entirely due to the importation of Indians. Durban was absolutely built up on the Indian population."[32]

The miserable lot of the Indians in South Africa roused great indignation in India and evoked strong protests from the Indian National Congress. Resolutions protesting against the disabilities actually or about to be imposed on Indian settlers in South Africa, and praying to Her Majesty's Government and the Government of India to guard their interests and remove their grievances were passed in almost each session since 1894. The following resolution, passed in 1903, may be taken as a fair specimen:

"That this Congress views with grave concern and regret the hard lot of His Majesty's Indian subjects living in the British

Colonies in South Africa, Australia and elsewhere, the great hardships and disabilities to which they are subjected by the Colonial Governments, and the consequent degradation of their status and rights as subjects of the King, and protests against the treatment of Indians by the colonies as backward and uncivilized races; and it prays that in view of the great part the Indian settlers have played in the development of the colonies and the economic advantages, which have resulted both to India and to the Colonies from their emigration to and stay in the latter, the Government of India will be pleased to ensure to them all the rights and privileges of British citizenship in common with the European subjects of His Majesty by enforcing, if necessary, such measures as will render it impossible for the colonies to secure Indian immigrants except on fair, equitable and honourable terms; and that in view of the great importance of the principle of equal treatment of all, His Majesty's Government should devise adequate measures to ensure that position to Indian emigrants in all the British Colonies".

The British Government had declared war against the Transvaal for securing commercial interests of Englishmen, but not only connived at, but sometimes even encouraged, the legislation seriously curtailing the rights and status of the Indians. This provoked the Congress to pass the following resolution in 1905:

"....In particular, this Congress records its most emphatic protest against the threatened enforcement, in an aggravated form, of the anti-Indian legislation of the late Boer Government of the Transvaal by the British Government. In view of the fact that one of the declared causes of the recent Boer War was the treatment meted out to the Indian subjects of the King-Emperor by the Government of that Republic, and in view also of the admitted loyalty of Indian settlers in South Africa and the help rendered by them during the war, this Congress fervently prays that the British Parliament will insist on a just and equal treatment being secured to Indian settlers in that Crown Colony".

But the British Government ignored all these pathetic appeals.

---

1. Bagal, J. C., *History of the Indian Association,* Appendix, p. XLV.
2. Ibid, 53.
3. Ibid, 104.
4. Ibid, 103.
5. Ibid, 104.
6. Ibid, Appendix, p. XXXIII.
7. Ibid, XXXV.
8. Ibid, XXXV-XXXVI.
9. Ibid, XXXVI-XXXVII.
10. Ibid, XXXVII-XXXVIII.
11. Ibid, XXXVIII-XXXIX.

12. Ibid, XXXIX.
13. Ibid, XXXIX-XL.
14. Ibid, XL.
15. Ibid, XL.
16. Ibid, XLII.
17. See pp. 364-5.
18. Bagal, op. cit., XLIII-XLIV.
19. Ibid, XLIV-XLV.
20. Cf. Vol. IX, pp. 922-25.
21. Bagal, op. cit., XLI-XLII.
22. See above, pp. 364-5.
23. Bagal, op. cit., XLV-XLVI.
24. Ibid, 104.
25. Ibid, 106.
26. Unpublished documents in CRO, London. The italics are not in the original. The letters have since been published. Cf. *Advent of Independence* by Dr. A.K. Majumdar, pp. 323-6.
27. C. Kondapi, *Indians Overseas*, p. 5.
28. There is a vast literature on the woeful condition of the Indentured labourers. Gokhale described it as a monstrous system (*Speeches*, 520). For a vivid description of the evils and fraudulent practices, cf. Report of Messrs. Andrews and Pearson on Indentured Labour in Fiji. Also cf. the speech of Madan-mohan Malaviya in the Imperial Legislative Council on March 20, 1916.
29. C. Kondapi, p. 8.
30. The account of Mauritius is mainly based on *The Indenture System in Mauritius, 1837-1915*, by S. B. Mookherji. The quotations are also from that work.
31. The major part of this section, dealing with the Transvaal, is based on the article "Indians in the Transvaal" by Iqbal Narain, published in the *Uttara Bharati*, Vol. IV, No. 2 (March, 1958), pp. 67-94. The official documents quoted will be found in this article with full references.
32. *IAR*, 1924, II. 329.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

(This Bibliography is arranged on the same plan as that adopted in Vol. IX, with the omission of Sections I and II which are unnecessary and Section IV, A and B, which is common to the two volumes).

I. GENERAL HISTORICAL WORKS

Abdulla, Yusuf Ali	A Cultural History of India during British Period, Bombay, 1940.
Abhedananda, Swami	India and Her People, New York, 1906.
Aga Khan	India in Transition, Bombay, 1918.
Agarwal, L. N.	Indian Nationalist Movement.
Andrews, C. F.	The Renaissance in India, London, 1912.
Bagal, J. C.	I. Bharatbarsher Svadhinata (in Bengali), Calcutta, B.S. 1354. II. Jativaira va amader Desatmabodh (in Bengali). III. Jatiyatar Navamantra va Hindumelar Itivritta. IV. Vidroha o Vairita. Calcutta, B.S. 1356. V. History of the Indian Association, 1876-1951, Calcutta, 1953. VI. Muktir Sandhane Bharat (in Bengali), Third Edition, Calcutta, B.S. 1367. VII. Unabinsa Satabdir Bangla (in Bengali) Calcutta, B.S. 1348.
Banerji, A. (Ed.)	Speeches by Lal Mohan Ghose, Calcutta, 1883.
Banerji, B. N.	I. Sambadpatre Sekaler Katha, 3 Vols., (in Bengali), Calcutta, 1950. II. Bangla Samayik Patra, 2 vols. (in Bengali), Calcutta, 1947-51.
Basu, B. D.	I. Rise of the Christian Power in India, Calcutta, 1933. II. India under the British Crown, Calcutta, 1933.
Basu, P. N.	History of Hindu Civilization during British Rule, Calcutta, 1897.
Besant, Annie	I. England & India, Harrogate, 1903. II. India—a nation, Adyar, 1930.
Blunt, W. S.	I. India under Ripon, a Private Diary, London, 1909. II. Ideas about India, London, 1885.
Bombay Association,	Minutes of the Proceedings of
Bose, C. N.	England's Administration of India, Calcutta, 1907.

Bose, N. S.	The Indian Awakening and Bengal, Calcutta, 1960.
Bose, Sudhindra.	Some Aspects of British Rule in India.
Bradley-Birt, F. B.	Twelve men of Bengal in the Nineteenth Century, Calcutta, 1910.
Buch, M. A.	I. Rise and Growth of Indian Liberalism, Baroda, 1938. II. Rise and Growth of Indian Militant Nationalism, Baroda, 1940. III. Rise and Growth of Indian Nationalism. Baroda, 1939.
Buckland, C. E.	I. Bengal under Lieutenant Governors, 2 vols., Calcutta, 1901. II. Dictionary of Indian Biography, London, 1906.
Burne, O. T.	Memories, London, 1907.
Campbell, G.	I. Memoirs of my Indian Career, 2 Vols., London, 1893. II. India as it may be, London, 1853.
Chailley, J.	Administrative Problems of British India, London, 1910.
Chintamani, C. Y.	Indian Politics since the Mutiny, London, 1940.
Chirol, Sir V.	I. Indian Unrest, London, 1910. II. India : Old and New, London, 1921.
Colvin, Sir Auckland	If it be Real what does it mean?
Cotton, Sir Henry	I. New India, London, 1907. (First published in 1885). II. Indian and Home Memories, London, 1911.
Cotton, H. E. A.	The Century in India, 1800-1900, Calcutta, 1901.
Coupland, Sir Reginald	India, A Re-statement, Bombay, 1945.
Cromer, Lord	Political and Literary Essays, London, 1913.
Cunningham, H. S.	British India and its Rulers, London, 1881.
Curzon, Marchioness of Kedleston	Reminiscences, London, 1955.
Danvers, F. C.	An index to events relating to India and the East referred to in *The Times*, 1850-89, London, 1897.
Das Gupta, Anil Chandra	Selections from Calcutta Gazette Vol. VI (1824-1832).
Datta, B. N.	Bharater Dvitiya Svadhinata Sangram (in Bengali).
Datta, K. K.	I. Education and Social Amelioration of Women in Pre-Mutiny India, Patna, 1936. II. Dawn of Renascent India, Nagpur, 1950.
Digby, William	'Prosperous' British India, London, 1901.
Dodwell, H.H. (Ed.)	The Cambridge History of India, Vol. V (1929), Vol. VI (1932).

DUBOIS, ABBE, J. A. Hindu Manners, Customs, and Ceremonies, Oxford, 1953.

DUTT, K. N. Landmarks of the Freedom Struggle in Assam, Gauhati, 1958.

DUTT, R. C. England and India, 1785-1885, London, 1897.

DUTT, SUKUMAR Problem of Indian Nationality, Calcutta, 1926.

EDEN, EMILY. Letters from India, 2 vols., London, 1872.

EDWARDS, L. Reminiscences of forty-three years in India, London, 1874.

FORBES, J. Oriental Memoirs, 2 Vols., London, 1834.

FRASER, SIR ANDREW Among Indian rajas and ryots, London, 1912.

GANESH & CO. (PUB.) I. Indian Nation Builders, Madras, 1921.
II. India's claim for Home Rule, Madras, 1917.

GARRATT, G. T. I. An Indian Commentary, London, 1928.
II. The Legacy of India (Edited), Oxford, 1937.

GHOSAL, J. Celebrated Trials in India, Calcutta, 1902.

GHOSE, AUROBINDO I. The Need in Nationalism and other Essays, Madras, 1923.
II. The Renaissance in India, Calcutta, 1946.
III. The Spirit and Form of Indian Polity, Calcutta, 1947.
IV. Speeches, Calcutta, 1948.
V. Bankim-Tilak-Dayananda, Calcutta, 1947.
VI. Bharater Navajanma (Rebirth of India), (in Bengali), Calcutta 1925.

GHOSE, BARINDRAKUMAR Wounded Humanity, Calcutta, 1934.

GHOSE, M. N. Sekaler Lok (in Bengali), Calcutta, B.S. 1346.

GHOSE, N. N. England's Work in India, Calcutta, 1909.

GHOSE, RAMGOPAL Public Speeches and Remarks on the Black Acts, Calcutta, 1871.

GHOSH, BINAY Samayik Patre Banglar Samajachitra, (in Bengali), 3 Vols. Calcutta, 1962-4.

GILCHRIST, R. N. Indian Nationality, London, 1920.

GOONARATNE, C.D.S. The Development of Political Consciousness in India, 1757-1793.

GOPAL, RAM British Rule in India, Bombay, 1963.

GRAHAM, A. The means of ameliorating India, Glasgow, 1835.

GRIFFITHS, SIR PERCIVAL The British Impact on India, London, 1952.

GUPTA A. (ED.) Studies in the Bengal Renaissance, Calcutta, 1958.

GUPTA, S. K. Unabinsa Satabdite Banglar Nabajagaran (in Bengali), Calcutta, 1959.

HAMILTON, LORD GEORGE Parliamentary Reminiscences, 1886-1906, London, 1922.

HEBER, R. Narrative of a Journey through the Upper Provinces of India etc., 2 Vols., London, 1828.

HOLLAND, W. Asian Nationalism and the West, New York, 1953.

Hough, W.	India as it ought to be under the new Charter Act, London, 1853.
Houston, J.	Representative Men of Bombay Presidency, 1897.
Hunter, W. W.	I. The India of the Queen and other Essays, London, 1903. II. Report of Education Commission appointed by Lord Ripon (Hunter Commission), 1882. III. The Imperial Gazetteer of India, 9 Vols., London, 1881.
Hutchinson, Lester	The Empire of the Nabobs, London, 1937.
Hyde, H. B.	Parochial Annals of Bengal, Calcutta, 1901.
Ikram, S. M. And Spear, P. (Ed.)	The Cultural Heritage of Pakistan, Karachi, 1955.
Iyengar, S. S. R.	Memorandum on the progress of the Madras Presidency, Madras, 1893.
Karkaria, R. P.	India, Forty years of Progress and Reform, London, 1896.
Kohn, H.	A History of Nationalism in the East, London, 1929.
Lahari, D.	Swadhinatar Itihas (The History of the Freedom Movement), Calcutta, 1909.
Lawrence, W.	The India we served, London, 1928.
Long, Reverend J.	Handbook of Bengal Missions, London, 1848.
Luard, R. D.	Reconstruction of our Indian Empire.
Lyall, Sir A. C.	Asiatic Studies, London, 1907.
Macdonald, J. R.	The Awakening of India, London, 1911.
Macnicol, N.	The Making of Modern India, Oxford, 1924.
Majumdar, B. B.	History of Political Thought, Calcutta, 1934.
Majumdar, J. K.	Indian Speeches and documents on British rule, 1821-1918, Calcutta, 1937.
Majumdar, R. C.	I. History of the Freedom Movement in India, Vol. I, Calcutta, 1962. II. Glimpses of Bengal in the Nineteenth Century, Calcutta, 1960.
Malabari, B. M.	The Indian Problem, Bombay, 1894.
Marshman, J. C.	The Life and times of Carey, Marshman and Ward, 2 Vols., London, 1859.
Marx, Karl	Articles on India, Bombay, 1945.
Mathew, Arthur	Christianity and the Government of India, London, 1929.
Mazumdar, A. C.	Indian National Evolution, Madras, 1917.
Mehta, Ashok, and Patwardhan, Achyut	The Communal Triangle in India, Allahabad, 1942.
Merney, Viscount	The Viceroys and Governors-General of India, 1857-1947, London, 1949.
Miles, A.	The Land of the Lingam, London, 1933.
Monier-Williams, Sir M.	Modern India and the Indians, London, 1879.
Morley, Viscount	Recollections, 2 Vols., London, 1917.

Mukerjee, Hirendranath	India struggles for Freedom, Bombay, 1946.
Mukherjee, Haridas and Uma	I. Sri Aurobindo's Political Thought, Calcutta, 1958.
	II. Sri Aurobindo and the New Thought in Indian Politics, Calcutta 1964.
	III. Bipin Chandra Pal and India's Struggle for Swaraj, Calcutta, 1958.
Müller, Max	Rammohan to Ramkrishna, Calcutta, 1952.
Mutiny and the Congress by an Old Bengali, Serampore, 1891.	
Noel, B. W.	England and India, an essay on the duty of Englishmen towards the Hindoos, London, 1859.
O'malley, L. S. S.	I. History of Bengal, Bihar and Orissa under British rule, Calcutta, 1925.
	II. The Indian Civil Service, 1901-1930, London, 1931.
	III. Indian Caste Customs, London, 1932.
	IV. India's Social Heritage, London, 1934.
	V. Modern India and the West, London, 1941.
Oswell, G. D.	Sketches of Rulers of India, 3 Vols., Oxford, 1908-09.
Pal, Bepin Chandra	I. Memoirs of My Life and Times, 2 Vols., Calcutta, 1932 and 1951.
	II. Brahmo Samaj and the Battle of Swaraj in India, Calcutta, 1926.
	III. Indian Nationalism, Madras, 1948.
	IV. Nationality and Empire, Calcutta, 1916.
	V. The New Spirit, Calcutta, 1907.
	VI. Character Sketches, Calcutta, 1957.
	VII. Nabajuger Bangla (in Bengali), Calcutta, B.S. 1362.
Pal, Kristodas	I. Young India Vindicated, a Discourse read at the Hare Anniversary Meeting, Calcutta, June 1856.
	II. Young Bengal Vindicated, Calcutta, 1856.
Parekh, C. L. (Ed.)	Eminent Indians on Indian Politics, Bombay, 1892.
Pillai, G. P.	Representative Indians. London, 1897.
Pradhan, R. G.	India's Struggle for Swaraj, Madras, 1930.
Prasad, Rajendra	India Divided, Bombay, 1946.
Prinsep, H. T.	The India Question in 1853, London, 1853.
Prinsep, V. C.	Imperial India, London, 1878.
Rai, Lajpat	I. The Arya Samaj, London, 1915.
	II. Unhappy India, Calcutta, 1928.
	III. Young India, New York, 1917.
	IV. England's Debt to India.
Rawlinson H. G.	The Legacy of India, Oxford, 1937.
Reynolds, R.	White Sahibs in India, London, 1946.
Routledge, J.	English Rule and Native Opinion in India, London, 1878.

Sandemann, Hugh	Selections from Calcutta Gazette, Vols. IV-V.
Sanyal, Ramgopal	A general bibliography of Bengal Celebrities, both living and dead, Calcutta, 1889.
Sarkar, Indira	Social thought in Bengal, Calcutta, 1949.
Seeley, Sir J. R.	The Expansion of England, London, 1883.
Sen, Amit	Notes on the Bengal Renaissance, Calcutta, 1957.
Sen, P. (Ed.)	Florence Nightingale's Indian Letters, 1878-82, Calcutta, 1937.
Seton, Sir M.	The India Office, London, 1926.
Seton-Carr, W. S.	Selections from Calcutta Gazettes, Vols. I-III.
Shore, F. J.	Notes on Indian Affairs, 2 vols., London, 1837.
Singh, G. N.	Landmarks in Indian Constitutional and National Development, Benares, 1933.
Smellie, K. B.	A hundred Years of English Government, London, 1948.
Smith, dr. G.	Twelve Indian Statesmen, London, 1897.
Spear, T. J. P.	I. The Nabobs, London, 1932. II. India, A Modern History, Ann Arbor, 1961.
Stokes, Whitley	The Anglo-Indian Codes, Oxford, 1886.
Strachey, Sir John.	India, London, 1888.
Sunderland, J. T.	India in Bondage, Calcutta, 1928.
Tagore, Raja Saurindramohan	Hindu Loyalty, Calcutta, 1883.
Tayler, W.	Thirty-eight years in India, 2 Vols., London, 1881.
Temple, Sir R.	India in 1880, London, 1880.
Thornton, Edward	I. India : its state and prospects, London, 1835. II. A Gazetteer of the territories under the Government of the Viceroy of India, London, 1886.
Topa, I.	I. The Growth and Development of National Thought in India, Hamburg, 1930. II. Our Cultural Heritage, Allahabad, 1940. III. Facts about India, Allahabad, 1944.
Trevelyan, C. E.	Papers transmitted from India, London, 1830.
Trevelyan, Sir G. O.	Life and Letters of Lord Macaulay, 2 Vols., London, 1895.
Trotter, L. J.	History of India under Queen Victoria, London, 1886.
Tupper, C. L.	Our Indian Protectorate, London, 1893.
Twining, T.	Travels in India a hundred years ago, London, 1893.
Wadud, Kazi Abdul.	Creative Bengal, Calcutta, 1950.
Ward, W.	A View of the History, Literature and Religion of the Hindoos, 2 Vols., Serampore, 1818.
West, A.	Private Diaries, London, 1922.
Whitehead, dr. H.	Indian Problems in Religion, Education, and Politics, London, 1924.
Wilson, Lady A. C.	Letters from India, London, 1911.
Zacharias, H. C. E.	Renascent India, London, 1933.

II. BIOGRAPHICAL WORKS

Banerji, Surendra Nath	I. Speeches of, by Raj Jogeshur Mitter, Calcutta, 1890. II. Speeches and Writings of, by G. A. Natesan, Madras, 1918. III. Speeches of, by R. C. Palit, Calcutta, 1880. IV. The Gospel of, Ed. by J. C. Roy, Calcutta, 1912. V. The Trumpet Voice of India : Speeches in England, Madras, 1919. VI. A Nation in Making, by himself, Calcutta, 1925.
Bentinck, Lord William	Life of, by D. Boulger, Oxford, 1892.
Besant, Annie	I. An Autobiography, London, 1893. II. A Sketch of her life, etc., Madras, 1913. III. Speeches and Writings of, by G. A. Natesan, Madras, 1921. IV. Life of, by B. C. Pal, Madras, 1917. V. Life of, by Sri Prakasa, Bombay, 1954.
Bonnerjee, W. C.	Ed. by Manmatha Nath Ghose, 2 Vols., Calcutta 1944.
Bose, Anandamohan	By Hem Chandra Sarkar, Calcutta, 1910.
Bose, Rajnarain	I. Life of, by J. C. Bagal, Calcutta, 1955. II. Atmacharit (in Bengali), Calcutta, 1952.
Bright, John	A sketch of his life and services to India, by G. A. Natesan, Madras.
Carey, William	I. By S. P. Carey. London, 1934. II. By George Smith, London, 1885. III. By F. D. Walker, London, 1926. IV. By Sajanikanta Das (in Bengali), B.S. 1349.
Curzon, Lord	I. India under Curzon and After, by Lovat Fraser, London, 1912. II. The Life of, by the Earl of Ronaldshay, London, 1928. III. Lord Curzon in India, by Sir Thomas Raleigh (Selections from Speeches), London, 1928. IV. Lord Curzon's Administration of India, by Ali Khan Sardar, Bombay, 1905.
Datta, Akshayakumar	Jibani, (in Bengali) by Mahendranath Vidyanidhi.
Dayananda Saraswati	I. Life of, by C. Y. Chintamani, Allahabad, 1917. II. The Man and his work, by Aurobindo Ghose, Allahabad, 1917. III. Sankara and Dayananda, by Harbilas Sarda, Ajmer, 1944.
Derozio, Henry	Derozio, the Eurasian Poet, Teacher and Journalist, by Thomas Edwardes. Calcutta, 1884. Vidrohi Derozio (in Bengali), by Binoy Ghosh

Dev, Raja Radhakanta	By J. C. Bagal, Calcutta, 1951.
Duff, Alexander	Life of, by G. Smith, London, 1879.
Dufferin and Ava, The Marquis of	I. By Black, C.E.D., London, 1903. II. Viceregal Life in India, by Marchioness of Dufferin, 2 Vols., London, 1889. III. The Life of, by Sir Alfred Lyall, 2 Vols., London, 1905.
Fawcett, Henry	A sketch of his life and services to India, by G. A. Natesan, Madras.
Ghosh, Girischandra	I. Selections from the Writings of, Ed. by Manmathanath Ghose, Calcutta, 1912. II. Life of, by Manmathanath Ghose, Calcutta, 1911.
Ghosh, Motilal	Memoirs of, by Paramananda Dutta, Calcutta, 1935.
Ghosh, Ramgopal	I. Speeches of, by A. L. Basu, Calcutta, 1835. II. His Life and Speeches, by C. C. Mitra, Calcutta, 1868.
Ghosh, Sisirkumar	Life of, by Anathnath Bose, Calcutta, 1920.
Gokhale, Gopal Krishna	I. Life of, by T. K. Sahani, Bombay, 1929. II. Life of, by J. S. Hoyland, Calcutta, 1946. III. Life of, by T. V. Parvate. IV. Speeches of, by G. A. Natesan, Madras, 1916. V. Speeches and Writings of, Ed. by R. P. Patwardhan, Bombay, 1962.
Hare, David	Biographical Sketch of, by Peary Chand Mitra, Calcutta, 1949.
Hume, Allan Octavian	Biographical Sketch of, by W. Wedderburn, London, 1913.
Khan, Syed Ahmad	The Life and Work of, by G.F.I. Graham, London, 1885.
Lahiri, Ramtanu	Ramtanu Lahiri o Tatkalin Banga Samaj (in Bengali), by Shivnath Sastri, Calcutta, 1955.
Macaulay, Lord	I. Life and Letters of, by G.O. Trevelyan, 2 vols., London, 1895. II. A sketch, by G. A. Natesan, Madras, 1923.
Malaviya, Madan Mohan	I. Commemoration Volume, Benares, 1932. II. His Life and Speeches, by Ganesh and Co., Madras, 1910. III. Speeches and Writings of, by G. A. Natesan, Madras, 1919.
Mehta, Sir Pheroze Shah	I. Speeches and Writings of, by C. Y. Chintamani (ed.), Allahabad 1905. II. A Political Biography, 2 Vols., by H. P. Mody, Bombay, 1921.
Metcalfe, Lord	Life and Correspondence of, by Sir John Kaye, 2 Vols., London, 1854.
Mitra, Digambar	Raja Digambar Mitra—His Life and Career, by Bholanauth Chunder, Calcutta, 1893.
Mitra, Kisorichand	Karmavir, by Manmathanath Ghosh.

Mitra, Raja Rajendralal	Speeches of, Ed. by Raj Jogeshur Mitter, Calcutta, 1892.
Mukherji, Harish	Writings of, Ed. by Dr. N. C. Sengupta.
Mukhopadhyaya, Dakshinaranjan	Life of, by Manmathanath Ghosh.
Munro, Thomas	I. Selections from Minutes and Official Writings of, by John Bradshaw, Oxford, 1894. II. Life of, by G. R. Gleig, 3 vols., London, 1930.
Naoroji, Dadabhai	Biographical Sketch of, by R. P. Masani, London, 1939.
Pal, Bipin Chandra	I. Memoirs of My Life and Times, 2 vols., Calcutta, 1932, 1951. II. Writings and Speeches of, Yugayatri (Pub.), Calcutta, 1954.
Pal, Krishtodas	I. Speeches and Minutes of, Ed. by Ramchandra Palit, Calcutta, 1882. II. A Study, by N. N. Ghose, Calcutta, 1887.
Prasad, Rajendra	Autobiography, Bombay, 1957.
Rai, Lala Lajpat	By G. A. Natesan, Madras.
Rama Krishna	I. Muller, F. Max. Rama Krishna—His Life and Sayings, II. Life of, by Romain Rolland, Calcutta, 1931. III. Life of, by Swami Saradananda (in Bengali).
Ranade, M. G.	I. Ranade, The Prophet of Liberated India, by D. G. Karve, Poona, 1942. II. Life of, by J. Kellock, Calcutta, 1926. III. Religious and Social Reform—A collection of Essays and Speeches, compiled by A. B. Kolaskar, Bombay 1902. IV. Life of, by T. V. Parvate, Bombay 1963.
Roy, Raja Rammohan	I. English Works of, Ed. by J. C. Ghosh, 2 Vols., Calcutta, 1887. II. English Works of, by Panini Office, and Sadharan Brahmo Samaj, Calcutta. III. The Life and Letters of, by S. D. Collet, London, 1900. Ed. by D. K. Biswas and P. C. Ganguli, Calcutta, 1962. IV. Rammohan and Progressive Movements in India—A Selection from Records (1775-1875). Ed. by J. K. Majumdar, Calcutta, 1941. V. Rammohun Roy, Ed. by Amal Home and published under the Auspices of the Rammohun Roy Centenary Committee, Calcutta, 1933. VI. Rammohun and the last Moguls—Selections from Official Records (1803-1859), Ed. by J. K. Majumdar, Calcutta, 1939.

Roy, Raja Rammohan	VII. Selection from Official letters and documents relating to the life of (1791-1830), Ed. by R. K. Chanda and J. K. Majumdar (Personal and Private affairs), Calcutta, 1938. VIII. Life of, by Iqbal Singh, Bombay, 1958. IX. The Last Days in England of, by Mary Carpenter, Calcutta, 1915. X. Biographical Sketch of, by Brajendranath Bandyopadhyay, Calcutta, 1946. (In Bengali B. S. 1349). XI. Mahatma Raja Rammohan Rayer Jiban Charit (in Bengali), by Nagendranath Chattopadhyay, Calcutta, 1897. XII. Life of, by Kisori Chand Mitra, Calcutta, 1866. XIII. A Review of the labours of, by L. Carpenter, London, 1833. XIV. Rammohun Roy and Modern India, by Ramananda Chatterji, Calcutta, 1911.
Sarasvati, Dayananda	See Dayananda.
Sastri, Sivanath	Atmacharit (in Bengali), Calcutta, B.S. 1359.
Savarkar, V. D.	Savarkar and his Times, by D. Keer, Bombay, 1950.
Sen, Keshab Chandra	I. Life and Teachings of, by P. C. Mazumdar, Calcutta, 1931. II. Biographical Sketch of, by Bepin Chandra Pal, Calcutta, 1893. III. Life of, by J. C. Bagal, Calcutta, 1958.
Tagore, Dwarakanath	Memoirs of, by Kisorichand Mitra, Calcutta, 1870. Bengali Translation (With Notes) by Dwijendralal Nath, Edited by Kalyankumar Dasgupta, Calcutta, 1962.
Telang, Kasinath	I. Selected Writings and Speeches of, introd. by D. E. Wacha, Bombay, 1916. II. Legislative Council Speeches of, Bombay, 1895. III. Centenary Memoir, Bombay, 1951.
Thakur Devendranath	I. Atmajibani (in Bengali), Ed. by Satis Chandra Chakravarty, Calcutta, 1927. II. Svarachita Jiban-Charit (in Bengali), Ed. by P. Sastri, Calcutta, 1898. III. Biography, by J. C. Bagal,
Three Departed Patriots	Anand Mohan Bose, Badruddin Tyabji and W. C. Bonnerjee, (By G. A. Natesan, Madras).
Tilak, Bal Gangadhar	I. Writings and Speeches of, with an appreciation by Aurobindo Ghose, Madras, 1919. II. Life and Times of, by N. C. Kelkar (in Mara-

thi), Translated by D. V. Divekar, Madras, 1928.
III. The Life of, by D. V. Athalye, Poona, 1921.
IV. The Life of, by V. G. Bhat, Poona, 1956.
V. A Study, by D. P. Karmakar, Bombay, 1956.
VI. Life of, by D. V. Tahmankar, London, 1956.
VII. Life of, by T. V. Parvate, Ahmedabad, 1958.
VIII. Reminiscences and Anecdotes of, Ed. by S. V. Bapat, Poona, 1924.
IX. Biographical Sketch of, by Ram Gopal, Bombay, 1956.
X. Tilak and Gandhi : a comparative sketch, by M. J. Kantkar, Nagpur, 1935.
XI. Life of, by D. Keer, Bombay, 1959.
XII. Landmarks in Lokmanya's Life, by N. C. Kelkar, Madras, 1924.
XIII. Full and Authentic Report of his trial, by N. C. Kelkar, Bombay, 1908.
XIV. The Legacy of, by T. L. Shay, Bombay, 1956.
XV. Speeches of, by R. R. Srivastava, Fyzabad, 1917.

THOMPSON, GEORGE
Speeches of, Ed. by Raj Jogeshur Mitter, Calcutta, 1895.

VIDYASAGAR, ISHWARCHANDRA
Biographies (in Bengali);
I. by Chandicharan Bandyopadhyaya, Allahabad, 1909.
II. by Biharilal Sarkar, Calcutta, 1895.
III. by Sambhuchandra Vidyaratna, Calcutta, n.d.
IV. Vidyasagar Prasanga (in Bengali), by Brojendranath Bandyopadhyaya, Calcutta, 1931.
V. Vidyasagar o Bangali Samaj (in Bengali), 3 Vols., by Binoy Ghosh, Calcutta, 1957-59.
VI. Vidyasagar Parichay (in Bengali), by J. C. Bagal, Calcutta, 1960.

VIVEKANANDA, SWAMI
I. Vivekananda, Patriot-Prophet, by B. N. Datta, Calcutta, 1954.
II. The Life of Vivekananda and the Universal Gospel, by Romain Rolland, Almora, 1947.
III. Eastern and Western Disciples, Life of Swami Vivekananda, 4 Vols., Mayavati.
IV. Biography, by Swami Nikhilananda, New York, 1953.
V. Centenary Memorial Volume, Calcutta, 1963.
VI. Complete Works in Eight Volumes, Advaita Ashram and Udbodhan Office, Calcutta.
VII. Vivekananda in America, New Discoveries, by Marie Louis Burke, Advaita Ashram, Calcutta, 1958.

VIII. Vivekananda, A Historical Review, by R. C. Majumdar, Calcutta, 1965.

Wedderburn, Sir W. I. Speeches, Ed. by Raj Jogeshur Mitter, Calcutta, 1899.
II. Life of, by S. K. Ratcliffe, London, 1923.

BIBLIOGRAPHY TO DIFFERENT CHAPTERS

CHAPTER I

THE INDIAN PEOPLE AT THE BEGINNING OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

See also General Bibliography under Bagal-I and VII; B. N. Banerji, I; B. D. Basu, I; N. S. Bose, Chailley, Hsber, Seeley, and Long. Also Biographical Works under Dwarakanath Tagore and Rammohan Roy (I-III).

Adam, W. Reports on Vernacular Education in Bengal, and Bihar, 1835, 1836, and 1838, Calcutta, 1868.

Datta, K. K. Bengal Subah, Calcutta, 1936.

Hill, S. C. Bengal in 1756-7, 3 Vols., London, 1905.

Khan, Ghulam Hussain The Siyar-ul-Mutakherin (Trans.), London, 1832.

CHAPTER II

ENGLISH EDUCATION

See also General Bibliography, under Carey, Chirol-II, K. K. Datta, Griffiths, Dubois, Heber. Hunter-II, Oswell, Shore, Trevelyan,Wood, and Whitehead. Also Biographical Works under Rammohan Roy-VII, Munro, and Curzon-III.

A Collection of Despatches from the Home Department on the subject of Education in India, 1854-68, Calcutta, 1870.

Ballhatchet, K. Social Policy and Social Change in Western India, London, 1957.

Baman Behram, B. K. Educational Controversies in India.

Banerjea, K. M. A Prize Essay on Native Female Education, Calcutta, 1841.

Banerji, S. N. Lord Macaulay and High Education in India, Calcutta, 1878.

Basu, A. N. Indian Education in Parliamentary Papers, Calcutta, 1952.

Basu, B. D. History of Education in India under the rule of the East India Company, Calcutta, 1935.

Besant, Annie Higher Education in India, Madras, 1932.

Bevan, E. Thoughts on Indian discontents, London, 1929.

Bose, C. N. High Education in India, an essay read at the Bethune Society on 25 April 1878, Calcutta, 1878.

BOSE, RAJNARAIN	Hindu Athaba Presidency Colleger Itibritta (in Bengali), Calcutta, 1875.
BILGRAMI, SAYYID AMIR ALI	Education in India, London, 1902.
CARPENTER, M.	Six Months in India, London, 1868.
CHAPMAN, P.	Hindu Female Education, London, 1839.
COUPLAND, SIR R.	Wilberforce, A Narrative, Oxford, 1923.
DUFF, ALEXANDER	State of Education in Bengal and Bihar, *Calcutta Review*, 1844.
DUTT, HARCHUNDER	An Address on Native Female Education, Calcutta, 25 July, 1855.
HOWELL, A.	Education in British India prior to 1854 and in 1870-71, Calcutta, 1872.

Hundred Years of the University of Calcutta, Calcutta University 1957.

LEITNER, W.	History of indigenous education in the Punjab, Calcutta, 1883.
LYALL, SIR A. C.	Asiatic Studies, London, 1907.
MAHMOOD, SYED	History of English Education in India, 1781-1893. Aligarh, 1895.
MAYHEW, ARTHUR	The Education in India, London, 1929.
MITRA, KISHORI CHAND	Education in India, Calcutta, 1859.
PARULEKAR, R. V.	I. Survey of indegenous education in the Province of Bombay. II. Selections from the Records of the Government of Bombay (Education).

Report of the Indian Universities Commission, 1903.

SATTIANADHAN, S.	History of Education in the Madras Presidency, Madras, 1894.
SHARP, H. AND RICHEY, J. A.	Selections from the Educational Records of the Government of India, 2 Vols., Calcutta, 1920-22.
THOMAS, F. W.	The history and prospects of British Education in India, London, 1891.
TREVELYAN, C. E.	On the Education of the People of India, London, 1838.

Selections from Educational Records of the Government of India, 2 Vols., Published by the National Archives of India, 1960 and 1963.

CHAPTER III

IMPACT OF WESTERN CULTURE

See General Bibliography under B. N. Banerji-I, Rajnarain Basu, Buch-I, Griffiths, O'Malley-V, B. C. Pal-II, Zacharias.

DAS GUPTA, H. N.	Studies in Western Influence on Nineteenth Century Bengali Poetry, 1857-1887, Calcutta, 1935.
SEN, PRIYARANJAN	Western Influence on Bengali Literature, Calcutta, 1932.

CHAPTER IV

NEW RELIGIOUS IDEAS

See General Bibliography under Long, Mayhew, Lajpat Rai-I, Ward, Whitehead, and Zacharias. Also Biographical Works under Rammohan Roy-III and X, Besant-I, Vivekananda, Ramakrishna, B. C. Pal, Ranade-III, Sen, Thakur and Dayananda.

Bose, B. C.	Rational Religion, Calcutta, 1934.
Duff, A.	India and Indian Missions, Edinburgh, 1839.
Edwardes, Sir H. B.	Prospect of the triumph of Christianity in India, London, 1866.
Farquhar, J. N.	Modern Religious Movements in India, New York, 1918.
Gambhirananda, Swami	History of the Ramakrishna Math and Mission, Calcutta, 1957.
Kaye, Sir J.	Christianity in India, London, 1859.
Leonard, G. S.	A history of the Brahmo Samaj, Calcutta, 1879.
Lovett, R.	History of the London Missionary Society, 1795-1895, 2 Vols., London, 1899.
Mukhopadhyaya, Bhudev	Banglar Itihas (in Bengali).
Natesan, G. A. (Pub.).	Chaitanya to Vivekananda, Madras, 1928.
Paton, W.	Alexander Duff, Pioneer of Missionary Education, London, 1923.
Richter, J.	History of Missions in India (Transl.), Edinburgh, 1908.
Ross, Sir E. D.	Hindu-Muhammadan Feasts, Calcutta, 1914.
Roysmith, W.	Nationalism and Reform in India, New Haven, 1938.
Sastri, Sivanath	History of the Brahmo Samaj, 2 Vols., Calcutta, 1911, 1912.
Sattianadhan, S.	Missionary work in India, Madras, 1884.
Sharrock, J. A.	Hinduism, ancient and modern, Westminster, 1913.
Sherring, M. A	The History of Protestant Missions in India, London, 1884.
Smith, G.	I. Life of Alexander Duff, London, 1879. II. Christianity in India, Edinburgh, 1864.
Somerville, A.	Crime and religious beliefs in India, Calcutta, 1931.
Stock, E.	History of the Church Missionary Society, London, 1899.
Thomas, P.	I. Christians and Christianity in India and Pakistan, London, 1954. II. Hindu Religion, Customs and Manners Bombay, n.d.
Wilson, H. H.	An account of the Religious Sects of the Hindus, Calcutta, 1899.

CHAPTER V

LITERATURE

See also the P.E.N. Books of 'The Indian Literatures'—Series.

Ahmad, Z.	India's Contribution to Arabic Literature.
Bandyopadhyay, A. K.	Unabinsa Satabdir Bangali o Bangla Sahitya, Calcutta, B. S. 1363.
De, Sushil Kumar	History of the Bengali Literature in the Nineteenth Century, Calcutta, 1962.
Dikshitar, V. R.	Studies in Tamil History and Literature, Madras, 1936.
Dutt, R. C.	The Literature of Bengal, London, 1895.
Frazer, R. W.	A Literary History of India, London, 1915.
Grierson, Sir, G. A.	The Modern Vernacular Literature of Hindusthan, Calcutta, 1889.
Majumdar, B. C.	Typical Selections from Oriya Literature, Calcutta University, 1925.
Sahitya Akademi.	Contemporary Indian Literature, New Delhi, 1959.
Saksena, Babu Ram	I. A History of Urdu Literature. II. Evolution of Awadhi, a branch of Hindi, Allahabad, 1938.
Sen, Priyaranjan	I. Modern Oriya Literature, Calcutta, 1947. II. Western Influence on Bengali Literature, Calcutta, 1932.
Sen, Sukumar	History of Bengali Literature, Sahitya Akademi, Delhi, 1960.

CHAPTER VI

THE PRESS

See also General Bibliography under Bagal-I, B. N. Banerji, K. K. Datta-II and Sanyal. Also Biographical Works under Munro-II, Metcalfe, Tilak-II, and B. C. Pal.

Barns, M.	The Indian Press, London, 1940.
Ghose, H. P.	I. The Newspaper in India, Calcutta, 1952. II. Press and Press Laws in India, Calcutta, 1930.
Lovett, P.	Journalism in India, Calcutta, 1928.
Natarajan, J.	History of Indian Journalism, Published by the Publications Division, Government of India, Delhi, 1955.
Sanial, S. C.	History of the Press in India, *Calcutta Review*, 1911.
Stanhope, Liecester	Sketch of the History and Influence of the Press in British India, London, 1823.

CHAPTER VII

SOCIAL REFORM

See General Bibliography under Buckland-I, K. K. Datta-I, Dubois, Griffiths, Malabari, and Miles. Also Biographical Works under Ranade-III.

Adam, W.	The Law and Custom of Slavery in British India, London, 1840.
Banaji, D. R.	Slavery in British India, Bombay, 1933.
Bhavnani, Enakshi	Women of India.
Basu, Rajnarayan	Sekal o Ekal (in Bengali), Bangiya Sahitya Parishad, Calcutta, B.S. 1358.
Bose, B. C.	Hindu Customs in Bengal, Calcutta, 1929.
Chattopadhyay, Kamaladevi	The awakening of Indian Women, Madras, 1939.
Chintamani, C. Y.	Indian Social Reform, Madras, 1901.
Colomb, P. H.	Slave catching in the Indian Ocean, London, 1873.
Coupland, Sir R.	The British Anti-Slavery Movement, London, 1933.
Leonard, G. S.	A History of the Brahmo Samaj, Calcutta, 1879.
Malabari, B. M.	Infant Marriage and Enforced Widowhood in India, Bombay, 1877.
Meadows-Taylor	Confessions of a Thug, London, 1839.
Mitter, S. C.	A Discourse on the Domestic Life and Condition of the Bengali Society, Calcutta, 1856.
Mody, C. R.	Female Infanticide, Bombay, 1849.
Moore, W. R.	Female Infanticide in the Benares Division, Calcutta, 1868.
Mukhopadhyaya, Amitabha	Movement for the Abolition of Sati in Bengal (Article in the *Bengal Past and Present*, Vol. IXXVII, Jan.-Dec. 1951).
Natarajan, S.	A Century of Social Reform in India, Bombay, 1954.
Peggs, J.	I. India's Cries to British Humanity, London, 1830.
	II. The Infanticides' Cry to Britain, London, 1844.
	III. Slavery in India, London, 1840.
	IV. The Suttee's Cry to Britain, London, 1828.
Ratcliffe, S. K.	Sir William Wedderburn and the Indian Reform Movement, London, 1923.
Roysmith, W.	Nationalism and Reform in India, New Haven, 1938.
Sastri, Sibnath	History of the Brahmo Samaj, Vols. I and II, Calcutta, 1911, 1912.
Sorabji, Cornelia	"Position of Hindu Women Fifty Years Ago", Our cause.
Stark, H. A.	Calcutta in Slavery Days, Calcutta, 1917.
Tattabhusan, Sitanath	Social Reform in Bengal, Calcutta, 1904.

Telang, K. T.	Notes on the Age of Consent Bill, Calcutta, 1891.
Thomas, P.	Indian Women Through the Ages, Bombay, 1964.
Thompson, E.	Suttee, London, 1928.
Thornton, E.	Illustrations of the History and practices of the Thugs, London, 1837.
Wilson, J.	History of the Suppression of Infanticide in Western India, 1855.

CHAPTER VIII

MUSLIM COMMUNITY

See General Bibliography under Aga Khan, Asok Mehta, Rajendra Prasad.

Ali, Syed Amir	The Spirit of Islam, London, 1923.
Ambedkar, B. R.	Pakistan, Bombay, 1946.
Aziz, A.,	Discovery of Pakistan, Lahore, 1957.
Aziz, K. K.	Britain and Muslim India, London, 1963.
Bahadur, Lal	The Muslim League, its History and Achievements, Agra, 1954.
Basu, P. N.	Hindu-Muslim Amity, Calcutta, n.d.
Bose, B. C.	Mahomedanism, Calcutta, 1931.
Burman, Devajyoti	Indo-Muslim Relations, Calcutta.
Cumming, Sir J.	Political India, 1832-1932, London, 1932.
Ghosh, P. C.	The Development of the Indian National Congress, Calcutta, 1960.
Gibbs, H. A. R.	Mohammedanism, London, 1949.
Gopal, Ram	Indian Muslims, A Political History (1858-1947), London, 1959.
Graham, G. F. I.	Syed Ahmad Khan, London, 1885.
Herklots, G.A. (Ed.)	Islam in India, Oxford, 1921.
Hunter, Sir W. W.	The Indian Musulmans, London, 1876.
Karim, R.	Bankimchandra o Musalman Samaj (In Bengali), Calcutta, 1944.
Khan, Syed Ahmad	I. Review on Dr. Hunter's Indian Mussalmans, London, 1872. II. On the Present State of Indian Politics, Allahabad, 1888.
Krishna, K. B.	The Problem of Minorities, London, 1939.
MacMunn, G. F. and Lovett, A. C.	The Armies of India, London, 1911.
Mir Hasan Ali, Mrs.	The Mussulmans of India, London, 1917.
Natesan and Co.	Eminent Mussalmans, Madras, 1922.
Noman, M.	Rise and Growth of the All-India Muslim League, Allahabad, 1942.
Peggs, J.	A Voice from India, London, 1847.
Sayyid, A. F.	On the Muhammadans of India, Calcutta, 1862.
Sen, Sachin	The Birth of Pakistan, Calcutta, 1963.
Smith, J. C.	Modern Islam in India, London, 1943.
Symonds, R.	The Making of Pakistan, London, 1949.

CHAPTER IX

SOCIAL RELATION BETWEEN ENGLISHMEN AND INDIANS

See General Bibliography under Blunt-I, Chirol-I, Cotton-II, Digby, Garratt-I, B. C. Pal-II, Reynolds, Routledge, Shore, Sunderland, and Tupper. Also Biographies under Ripon-I, and Dwarakanath Tagore.

Carey, W. H.	The Good old Days of the Honourable John Company, 2 Vols., Calcutta, 1906-07.
Eden, Emily	Up the Country, 2 Vols., London, 1866.
Garth, Sir Richard	A Few Plain Truths about India, London, 1888.

Lord Ripon and the People of India: Proceedings of the Public Meeting held in Willis's Rooms London, 1 August, 1883.

Majumdar, A. K.	Advent of Independence, Bombay, 1963.
Mill, J. S.	Considerations on Representative Government, London, 1861.
Morrison Sir T.	Imperial Rule in India, Westminster, 1899.
Noel, B. W.	England and India. An Essay on the Duty of Englishmen towards the Hindoos, London, 1859.
Ratcliffe, S. K.	Sir William Wedderburn, London, 1923.

CHAPTER X

BRITISH POLICY TOWARDS INDIA

See General Bibliography under Digby, Ram Gopal, Griffiths, Lawrence, O'Malley-V, and Temple. Also Biographical Works under Curzon-II & III, and Hume.

Bryan, W. J.	On British Rule in India, London, 1915.
Frere, Sir H. B.	Means of ascertaining public opinion in India, London, 1871.
Keith, A. B.	Speeches and Documents on Indian Policy, Vol. I, London, 1922.
Mazumdar, A. C.	Indian National Evolution, Madras, 1917.
Morley, Viscount	Recollections, 2 Vols., London, 1917.
Morrison, Sir T.	Imperial Rule in India, Westminster, 1899.
Naoroji, D.	Poverty and Un-British Rule in India, London, 1901.
Peggs, J.	India's Cries to British Humanity, London, 1830.
Phillips, C. H.	Letters from India, 1829-32, London, 1936.

CHAPTER XI

THE ATTITUDE OF INDIANS TOWARDS BRITISH RULE

See General Bibliography under K. K. Datta-II, Digby, R. C. Dutt, and Lajpat Rai. Also Biography of Dadabhai Naoroji.

Deuskar, S. G.	Desher Katha (in Bengali).
Dutt, R. Palme	India To-day, Bombay, 1949.
Ghose, N. N.	Indian Views of England, Calcutta, 1877.
Malabari, B. M.	The Indian Eye on English Life, Westminster, 1893.
Mitra, S. M.	Anglo-Indian Studies, London, 1913.

CHAPTER XII

GROWTH OF POLITICAL IDEAS AND POLITICAL ORGANIZATIONS (UP TO 1858)

See General Bibliography under Agarwal, B. N. Banerji, Sukumar Dutt, Griffiths, A. Gupta, B. B. Majumdar, A. C. Mazumdar, Pradhan, and Topa. Also Biographical Works under Devendra Nath Thakur, Dadabhai Naoroji, Dwarakanath Tagore, Rajendralal Mitra, and Harish Mukherji.

Roysmith, W.	Nationalism and Reform in India, New Haven, 1938.

CHAPTER XIII

BIRTH OF NATIONALISM

See General Bibliography under Besant-II, Cotton, Gilchrist, Griffiths, Macdonald, B. B. Majumdar, H. & Uma Mukherjee, B. C. Pal. Also Biographical Works under S. N. Banerji, Vivekananda, Gokhale, and Dayananda.

Banerjea, D. N.	India's Nation Builders, London, 1919.
Chatterjee, Bankimchandra	Anandamath (The Abbey of Bliss) Transl. Ghose, Aurobindo and Barindra, Calcutta, 1948.
Desai, A. R.	Social Background of Indian Nationalism, Bombay, 1948.
Raghuvanshi, V. P. S.	Indian Nationalist Movement and Thought, Agra, 1959.

CHAPTER XIV

DEVELOPMENT OF POLITICAL IDEAS AND ORGANIZATIONS (1858-1885)

See General Bibliography under Bagal-V, Cotton, R. C. Majumdar, A. C. Mazumdar, and R. Sanyal. Also Biographical Works under S. N. Banerji, Dadabhai Naoroji, Dwarakanath Tagore, and Anandamohan Bose.

Cotton, H. J. S.	History of the Indian Association, Calcutta, 1903.

De Mello, F. M. — The Indian National Congress, London, 1934.
Journal of the Poona Sarvajanik Sabha.
Ilbert Bill, The: A Collection of Articles, Memorials, Petitions etc., London, 1883.
Khan, Syed Ahmad — On the Present State of Indian Politics, Allahabad, 1888.
Natesan, G. A. (Pub.). — Indian National Congress, Madras, 1917.
Nevinson, H. W. — The New Spirit in India, London, 1908.

CHAPTER XV

THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS

See General Bibliography under Chintamani, A. Gupta, R. C. Majumdar, A. C. Mazumdar, B. C. Pal-I. Also Biographical Works under S. N. Banerji, A. O. Hume.

Andrews, C. F. and Mukherjee, G. — Rise and Growth of Congress in India, London, 1938.
Besant, A. — How India Wrought for Freedom, Adyar, 1915.
Chakraborty, D. And Bhattacharya, C. — Congress in Evolution, Calcutta, 1935.
Das Gupta, H. N. — The Indian National Congress, Calcutta, 1940.
Ghose, H. P. — Congress o Bangla (in Bengali), Calcutta, 1935.
Ghosh, P. C. — Indian National Congress, Calcutta, 1960.
Natesan, G. A. — Indian National Congress, Madras, 1917.
Report of the Regional Records Survey Committee for West Bengal, 1957-58.
Sastri, V. S. — The Indian National Congress, Madras, 1911.
Sitaramayya, P. — The History of the Indian National Congress, 2 Vols., Bombay, 1946.
Wallace, D. M. (Edited). — Dufferin's Speeches in India, 1884-88, London, 1890.

CHAPTER XVI

THE NATIONALIST MOVEMENT IN POLITICS

See General Bibliograpy under Buch, B. N. Datta, Lajpat Rai.

Ghose, Arabinda — I. Rishi Bankim Chandra, Chandernagore, 1923.
II. On Himself and on the Mother, Pondicherry, 1953.
Lovett, Sir V. — History of the Indian Nationalist Movement, London, 1921.
Natesan, G. A. — Indian National Congress, Madras, 1917.
Rai, Lajpat — Young India, New York, 1917.
Sedition (Rowlatt) Committee Report, 1919.

CHAPTER XVII

INDIAN SERFS AND SLAVES IN THE BRITISH EMPIRE

See also General Bibliography under Bagal-V.

Andrews, C. F.	India and the Pacific, London, 1937.
Cumpston, I. M.	Indians Overseas in British Territories, 1834-54, London, 1953.
Das, R. K.	Hindustani Workers of the Pacific Coast, Berlin, 1923.
Gillon, K. L.	Fiji's Indian Migrants, London, 1962.
Gunther, John	Inside Africa, London, 1955.
Karunakaran, K. P.	India in World Affairs, Calcutta, 1952.
Kondapi, C.	Indians Overseas, 1838-1949, New Delhi, 1951.
Mabel, P.	Natal's Indian Problems.
Mayer, A. C.	I. Peasants in the Pacific, London, 1961. II. Indians in Fizi, London, 1963.
Mookherji, S. B.	I. Indian Minority in South Africa, New Delhi, 1959. II. The Indenture System in Mauritius, 1837-1915, Calcutta, 1962.
Narain, Iqbal	Indians in the Transvaal (*Uttara Bharati,* Vol. IV, No. 2, March, 1958).
Natesan, G. A.	Speeches of G. K. Gokhale, Madras, 1909.
Netto, George	Indians in Malaya, Singapore, 1961.
Smuts, J. C.	Africa and some World Problems.
Tagore, Dwarkanath	A History of Indians in British Guiana.

CHRONOLOGY

1706	Zeigenbalg, the first Christian Missionary arrives in India (p. 150).
1740	Birth of Muhammad Nazir, Urdu Poet (p. 214).
1757	Battle of Plassey (p. 1).
1763	Birth of Lalluji Lal, Hindi author (p. 182).
1767	Bolts makes an unsuccessful attempt to start a newspaper (p. 222).
1774	Birth of Rammohan Roy (p. 97).
	Warren Hastings—Governor General (p. 2).
1776	Birth of Dayaram, Gujarati poet (p. 190).
1780	James Augustus Hicky starts a weekly paper called *Bengal Gazette* or *Calcutta General Advertiser* (p. 223).
	The *India Gazette* published (p. 223).
1781	Calcutta Madrasa founded by Warren Hastings (p. 42).
1782	Hicky convicted of libel and his paper closed (p. 223).
	Syed Ghulam Husain writes the *Seir-ul Mutaqherin* (p. 340).
	The *Calcutta Gazette* published (p. 223).
1784	The *Madras Courier* published (p. 223).
1785	Court of Directors sanctions permanent annual grant for three schools in Madras (p. 72).
1787	Organized agitation against slavery in England (p. 280).
1788	Birth of Sadashiv Kashinath *alias* Bapu Chhatre, Marathi writer (p. 185).
1789	Birth of Muhammad Ibrahim Zauq, Urdu poet (p. 214).
	The *Bombay Herald* published (p. 224).
	Collection of persons for exportation as slaves declared illegal (p. 280).
1790	The *Bombay Courier* published (p. 224).
1791	The Quran translated into Urdu by Shah Abdu'l Qadir (p. 147).
	Sanskrit College, Benaras, founded by Jonathan Duncan (pp. 42, 74).
	The *Bombay Gazette* published (p. 224).
1792	The *Bombay Gazette* amalgamated with the *Bombay Herald* (p. 224).
1793	Charter Act passed (p. 42).
	William Carey arrives at Calcutta (p. 151).
1795	Herasim Lebedeff stages a play in Calcutta (p. 175).
	The *India Herald* and the *Weekly Madras Gazette* published (p. 223).

1798	Birth of Hansarāja, Marathi poet (p. 188).
1799	Birth of Parshurām Balwant *alias* Parashurām Pant Tatya Godbole, Marathi writer (p. 186).
	Wellesley passes a regulation for controlling the Press (p. 229).
	Madras Government imposes a pre-censorship on newspapers (pp. 223-24).
1800	Christian Missionaries establish a printing press at Serampore (p. 162).
	Foundation of Fort William College (p. 166).
	Birth of Muhammad Mu'min Khan Mumin. Urdu poet (p. 214).
	English School established at Bhawanipore, Calcutta (p. 31).
1801	William Carey publishes a Bengali grammar (p. 167).
	Ramram Basu's *Pratāpādityacharita*, published (p. 167).
1802	Birth of Babar Ali Anis, Urdu poet (p. 214).
1803	Rammohan Roy writes the *Tuhfat-ul-Muwahhiddin* (p. 97).
	Birth of Ranchodbhai Girdharbhai, Gujarati writer (p. 190).
	Birth of Salamat Ali Dabir, Urdu poet (p. 214).
1804	Birth of Hari Keshavji, Marathi author (p. 185).
1805	Rammohan joins service under Digby (p. 97).
1806	Publication of the *Grammar of the Maratha Language* (p. 184).
	Birth of Ghalib, Urdu poet (p. 214).
	Bālbodhmuktāvali (Marathi), published (p. 187).
	Birth of Dāśarathi Rāy, Bengali poet (p. 172).
1807	Slave trade abolished in the British Empire (p. 280).
1808	Birth of Henry Louis Vivian Derozio (p. 434).
1809	Hindu-Muslim riot at Banaras (p. 326).
1810	Birth of Bal Gangadhar Jambhekar, Marathi writer (p. 185).
	Publication of the *Marathi-English* Dictionary (p. 184).
1811	Importation of slaves into India forbidden (p. 280).
1812	Birth of Īśvar Chandra Gupta, Bengali poet (p. 172).
	William Carey writes the *Itihāsamālā* in Bengali (p. 167).
1813-54	Viśvanātha Siṁha Vāghelā of Rewa, author of fifty works on Rāma cult (p. 164).
1813	Charter Act passed. Grant of one lakh of Rupees per year for education (42-3).
	Charter Act permits Christian Missionaries to preach in British India (p. 153).

	Birth of Vithoba Annās Daftardār, Marathi poet (p. 188).
1814	Birth of Dādoba Paṇḍurang Tarkhadkar, Marathi grammarian (p. 185).
	Birth of Pyārī-chañd Mitra, Bengali author (p. 173).
	Rammohan Roy retires from service and settles at Calcutta (p. 98).
	A. Barnes founds "The Society for Promoting the Education of the Poor within the Government of Bombay" (Bombay Education Society) (p. 190).
	English School established at Chinsura (p. 31).
1815	William Carey composes a Bengali-English dictionary (p. 167).
	Rammohan founds the Ātmīya Sabhā (p. 98).
	Bombay Native Education Society formed (p. 70).
	Hitopadeśa and *Pañchatantra* (Marathi) Published (p. 187).
1817	Birth of Sir Syed Ahmad Khan (pp. 143, 305).
	A missionary opens two schools in Madras (p. 72).
	Hindu College, Calcutta, founded (p. 31).
	Establishment of the Calcutta School Book Society (p. 31).
1818	The *Bāṅgāl Gejeṭi* published (May) (pp. 169, 224).
	Publication of the *Samāchāra Darpaṇa* (Bengali Weekly) (May 23) (pp. 169, 224).
	Publication of *Digdarśana* (Bengali monthly) (pp. 169, 224).
	James Silk Buckingham publishes the *Calcutta Journal* (October 2) (p. 230).
	Legal restriction on the Indian Press withdrawn (p. 229).
	Serampore College established (p. 68).
	Death of Shāh Rafi‘uddīn, Arabic scholar (p. 209).
	Calcutta School Society established (p. 32).
1819	Rammohan Roy defeats Subrahmanya Śāstrī in a debate on idol worship (p. 98).
	Death of Dildār ‘Ali, first Indian-born Shi‘a Mujtāhid (p. 209).
	Calcutta Female Juvenile Society founded (p. 285).
1820	Birth of Akshay-kumār Datta, Bengali writer (p. 176).
	Birth of Īśvar-chandra Vidyāsāgar (p. 173).
	Muslims assault a Durgā Pūjā procession at Calcutta (p. 326).
	Native School and School Book Society (Bombay) formed (p. 70).

1821	Rammohan publishes the *Sambāda Kaumudī* (pp. 170, 224).
	Poona Sanskrit College (later Deccan College) opened (October 6) (p. 70).
	A British officer writes: "*Divide et Impera* should be the motto of our Indian administration..." (p. 321).
1822	Birth of Rājendra-lāl Mitra (p. 176).
	Birth of Bholānāth Sarābhāi, Gujarati Writer (p. 192).
	Death of Muhammad Ghaus Sharf'ul Mulk bin Nizāmuddīn Ahmad, Arabic scholar (p. 209).
	Death of Munshi Kundan Lal *alias Ashki*, Persian poet (p. 209).
	The Government of India requests the Court of Directors to empower them to control the Press (p. 231).
	The *Bombay Samāchār* (Gujarati) published (p. 225).
	The *Samāchāra-chandrikā* (Bengali) published (March 5) (p. 225).
	Rammohan starts the Persian weeky *Mirāt-ul -Akhbār* (April) (p. 225).
	The *Jam-i-Jahan Numa* published (p. 225).
	The *Sambāda-Kaumudī* ceases publication (p. 225).
1823	Agra College established (p. 74).
	Sanskrit College, Calcutta, founded by Lord Amherst (p. 43).
	Birth of Aḷiya Liṅga Rāja, Sanskrit and Kannada writer (p. 201).
	Birth of Rāmaliṇga Swāmigal, Tamil poet (p. 196).
	Birth of Gopāl Hari Deshmukh *alias* Lokhitawādi, Marathi writer (p. 189).
	Press Ordinance passed (March 14) (p. 232).
1824	Sanskrit College, Calcutta begins to function (1st January) (p. 68).
	Birth of Michael Madhusūdan Datta, Bengali poet (p. 172).
	Birth of Svāmī Dayāṇanda (p. 108).
	First native girls' schools opened in Bombay (p. 72).
	The Court of Directors sends a despatch on the general principle of educational policy in India (p. 44).
1825	Rammohan Roy establishes the Vedānta College (p. 98).
	Oriental College established in Delhi (p. 74).
1826	Derozio appointed teacher in the Hindu College (p. 435).
	Birth of Rāj-nārāyan Basu (p. 176).

1827	Birth of Bhūdev Muhhopādhyāy (p. 173).
	The Jury Act passed (p. 437).
	The *Calcutta Chronicle* suppressed (p. 234).
	The Book and Tract Society (Maharashtra) etablished (p. 186).
	Birth of Raṅgalāl Bandyopādhyāy, Bengali poet (p. 172).
1828	Rammohan founds the first *Samāj* (August 20) (p. 100).
	Bapu Chhatre's *Aesop's Tales* published (p. 187).
	English introduced in Delhi College (p. 74).
	Birth of Amir Ahmad Minai, Urdu poet (p. 214).
	Mrs. Wilson (*née* Miss Cook) takes charge of the Central School (p. 286).
	Death of Shāh 'Abd'ul 'Aziz, Arabic scholar (p. 209).
1829	Satī abolished by Regulation XVII (December 4) (pp. 100, 274).
	Rammohan publishes the *Bengal Herald* (English) and the *Baṅgadūta* (Bengali) (p. 170)
	Mrs. Wilson opens her first female school in Bombay (p. 72)
	Birth of Ānandarām Dhekial Phukan, Assamese writer (p. 178).
	Swāthi Thirunal becomes the Mahārāja of Travancore (p. 203).
	Birth of Mahipatrām Ruprām, Gujarati writer (p. 192).
1830	British begins to import Indian labour in Mauritius (p. 613).
	Rammohan Roy opens his Church (January 23) (p. 100).
	Rammohan goes to England (p. 518).
	General Assembly's Institution of the Church of Scotland founded by Dr. Duff (p. 68).
	G. S. Jambhekar and J. Shankarshet agitate for re-conversion of Christians (p. 265).
	Birth of Dīnabandhu Mitra, Bengali playwriter (p. 175).
	Kartābhajā sect founded by Rāmsaran Pāl at Ghoshpara (p. 139).
	The Parthenon published (pp. 40, 444).
	Ārur Bhaṭṭatiri writes the *Uttara Naishadha* (p. 164).
	Death of Sadāshiv Kāshināth *alias* Bapu Chhatre (p. 185).
	Death of Muhammad Nazīr, Urdu poet (p. 214).
	Death of Qāzi Muhammad Ismā'il, Arabic scholar (p. 209).

1831 Molesworth's *Marathi-English Dictionary* published (p. 185).
Birth of Bābā Padmanji, Marathi novelist (p. 187).
First Bengali stage set up by Prasanna-kumār Tagore (p. 175).
Death of Henry Louis Vivian Derozio, Indo-Anglian poet (December 26) (pp. 216, 435).
Kāśī-prasād Ghose's *The Shair and other Poems* (English) published (p. 216).
Saiyid Ahmad, the Wahabi leader, dies at the Battle of Balakot (6th May) (p. 141).
The Gyananneshun published (pp. 40, 444).
Publication of *Darpan*, Marathi Journal (p. 186).
Birth of Mirzā Khān Dāgh, Urdu poet (p. 214).
Bodhakathā (Marathi) published (p. 187).

1832 Birth of Dr. Kīrtikar B. D. Palande, Marathi poet (p. 188).
The *John Bull* (later the *Englishman*) published (p. 242).

1833 Death of Rammohan Roy (p. 101).
Birth of Narmadāshaṅkar Lālshaṅkar, Gujarati writer (p. 191).
Slavery abolished in Britain (p. 280).

1834 Wilson College (originally called General Assembly's Institution) founded as a High School in Bombay (p. 71).

1835 The Sheriff of Calcutta calls a public meeting to protest against the Charter Act of 1833 (January 5) (p. 438).
Beginning of Elphinstone College, Bombay (p. 70).
Calcutta Medical College opened (June) (p. 69).
Press Law of Sir Charles Metcalfe passed (August 2) (p. 234).
Birth of Nandshankar Tuljāshankar, Gujarati writer (p. 192).
Death of Lalluji Lal, Hindi writer (p. 182).
Birth of Hem-chandra Barua, Assamese writer (p. 178).
Birth of Bihāri-lāl Chakravarti, Bengali poet (p. 173).
Adam's report on Vernacular Education (I) (p. 60).
Lord Bentinck's Resolution on education (pp. 22, 48).

1836 Birth of Śrī Rāmakṛishṇa Paramahaṁsa (p. 116).
The Board of Public Instruction reconstituted as the Committee of Native Education (Madras) (p. 73).

Adam's Report on Vernacular Education (II) (p. 60).

Birth of Navalram Lakshmīrām, Gujarati writer (p. 192).

Death of Imām Baksh Nāsikh, Urdu poet (p. 214).

1837 Calcutta Landholders decide to establish an association (p. 446).

General Assembly's Institution known as the Christian College founded (Madras) (p. 74).

Two Acts passed for regulating the recruitment of Indian labour for Mauritius (p. 614).

The *Syed-ul-Akhbār* published (p. 225).

Birth of Guṇābhirām Baruā, Assamese writer (p. 178).

Birth of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad founder of the Ahmadiya sect (p. 145).

Birth of Ranchoḍbhāi Udayram, Gujarati playwright (p. 192).

Hindu-Muslim riot at Thana (Bombay) (p. 332).

Birth of Altaf Husain Pānipati *alias* Hali, Urdu poet (p. 215).

1838 Birth of Bankim-chandra Chatterji (p. 173).

Birth of Surendra-nath Majumdar, Bengali poet (p. 173).

Birth of Hem-chandra Bandopadhyay, Bengali poet (p. 172).

Devendra-nāth Tagore becomes a Brāhma (p. 101).

The first hospital opened in Calcutta (p. 69).

The *Bombay Times* (later the *Times of India*) published (p. 225).

The Government of India suspends emigration of Indian labourers to Mauritius, British Guiana and other places (July 11) (p. 614).

A public meeting at Calcutta condemns the malpractices in the export of Indian labourers (p. 614).

The *Delhi Akhbār* published (p. 225).

Hooghli College established (p. 68).

Adam's Report on Vernacular Education (III) (p. 60).

Zamindari Association later called Landholders' Society (Bengal) inaugurated (July) (p. 446).

The *Hindu Pioneer* published (p. 40).

Kṛishṇamāchārya's *Hosagannaḍa Nuḍigannaḍi*, a grammar of New Kannaḍa, printed (p. 201).

1839 Devendra-nāth Tagore establishes the *Tattvabodhinī Sabhā* (p. 101).

British India Society established in England, (p. 447).

Lord Elphinstone recommends the establishment of a Collegiate Institution at Madras (p. 73).

1840 Birth of Dwijendra-nath Tagore (p. 173).

Birth of Kālī-prasanna Siṁha (p. 177).

Birth of Śivanārāyaṇa Paramahaṁsa (p. 137).

Birth of V. J. Kirtane, Marathi playwright (p. 188).

1841 A female hospital begins to function in Calcutta (p. 69).

The Committee of Native Education reconstituted as the University Board (Madras) (p. 73).

Central School converted into a High School (Madras) (p. 74).

Publication of *Digdarśan*, Marathi Journal, by Jambhekar (p. 186).

Publication of *Prabhākar*, Marathi Journal, by Bhau Mahājan (p. 186).

British India Society publishes its Journal, the *British India Advocate* (p. 447).

1842 Birth of Mahadev Govind Ranade (p. 486).

The Bengal Spectator published (p.p. 40, 444).

Publication of *Jñanodaya*, Marathi Journal by Missionaries (p. 186).

The Government of India under pressure from British authorities passes an Act permitting emigration of Indian labour (p. 614).

1843 Slavery declared illegal in India (p. 280).

Devendra-nāth Tagore formally becomes a Brāhma (p. 101).

The Council of education replaces the Committee of Public Instruction in Bengal (p. 49).

Institution of the Free Church of Scotland established (p. 69).

Bengal British India Society established (April 20). (p. 448).

Hindu College students at a public meeting send a memorial to the Court of Proprietors 'praying for the bestowal of more offices on Indians' (April 18) (p. 442).

Birth of Phakir-mohan Senāpati (p. 179).

1844 Four Indians proceed to England for training in Medicine (p. 69).

A class for training engineers opened in the Elphinstone Institution (Bombay) (p. 71).

Educational Despatch of Lord Hardinge (p. 49).

Birth of Giriś-chandra Ghose, Bengali actor and playwright (p 176).

Death of Abū Sulaimān Muhammad Ishāq, Arabic scholar (p. 209).

1845	Council of Education in Calcutta under the Presidentship of Charles Hay Cameron draws up a plan for a University of Calcutta (p. 49). Grant Medical College (Bombay) opened (October) (p. 71). Birth of Keralavarma Valiya Koil Tampurān, Sanskrit poet (p. 164). Birth of Jogendra-nāth Vidyābhushaṇ, Bengali writer (p. 177).
1846	Birth of *Bhāratendu* Hariś-chandra (p. 182). Christian Missionaries publish the *Arunodaya Samvad Patra* (Assamese) (p. 178). The firt regular session of Grant Medical College, Bombay, begins (June 16) (p. 71). St. Joseph's College established at Nagapatam (p. 74). Death of Bāl Gaṅgādhar Jambhekar (p. 185). Death of Haidar 'Alī Ātish, Urdu poet (p. 214).
1847	Engineering College, Roorkee, founded (p. 52). Death of Swāthi Thirunal, Mahārājā of Travancore. (p. 203). Death of Nawāb Amīr Hasan Khān of Kakori, Persian poet. (p. 213).
1848	The Council of Education, Bengal, stresses the necessity of combining vernacular with English education (p. 68). A. Kinloch Forbes founds "The Gujarat Vernacular Society" (now called Gujarāt Vidyā Sabhā) at Ahmedabad (p. 190). The Jñanaprasārak Sabhā (Maharashtra) established (p. 186). The Students' Literary and Scientific Society (Maharashtra) established (p. 186). Thomason submits his scheme for re-organizing the educational system in U.P. (p. 75). Birth of Rādhā-nāth Rāy, Oriya poet (p. 179).
1849	Hindu Bālikā Vidyālaya founded in Calcutta by J. E. Drinkwater Bethune and Iśvarchandra Vidyāsāgar (May) (pp. 66, 70, 291). The Roorkee Engineering College placed on a permanent footing (p. 76). Michael Madhū-sūdan publishes his first work, the *Captive Ladie* (English) (p. 216). Publication of the *Jñānaprakāśa* (Marathi Journal (p. 186). Birth of Rājakrishna Rāy, Bengali playwright (p. 175). Birth of Jyotirindra-nāth Tagore (p. 175). Birth of Indra-nāth Bandyopādhyāy, Bengali author (p. 177). A female School opened at Baraset (p. 290).

1850	Publication of the Hindi Journal *Sudhākar* (p. 183).
	Death of Muhammad Mu'min Khan Mu'min, Urdu poet (p. 214).
	Bareilly College founded (p. 74).
	Birth of Vishṇu Kṛishṇa-śāstrībuwa Chiplunkar, Marathi writer (p. 189).
	Publication of the *Buddhiprakāś*, Gujarati fortnightly (p. 191).
	Dalpatram writes *Hunnarkhānnī Chaḍāī*, Gujarati poem (p. 191).
1851	British Indian Association (Calcutta) founded (October 29) (p. 448).
	Dadabhai Naoroji publishes the *Rast Goftar* (Gujarati) (p. 226).
	Jotiba Phule starts a girls' school at Poona (p. 265).
	Madras Medical School raised to the status of College (p. 74).
	The Dakshina Prize Committee (Maharashtra) established (p. 186).
	Prasannarāghava, the first Marathi play written (p. 188).
	Birth of Lālā Śrīnivāsadās, Hindi playwright (p. 183).
	Birth of Chintamani Péthkar, Marathi poet (p. 188).
	Hindu-Muslim riot in Bombay (p. 326).
1852	Publication of the *Vichāralaharī*, Marathi Journal (p. 186).
	Dadabhai Kāvāsji publishes the *Akhbār-o-Soudāgar* (p. 226).
	Death of Dayaram, Gujarati poet (p. 190).
	The Bombay Association inaugurated (p. 459).
1853	Hariś-chandra Mukherji publishes the *Hindoo Patriot* (p. 225).
	A College Department added to the Central High School which later developed into Presidency College, Madras (p. 74).
	Government schools founded at Cuddalore and Rajhamundry (p. 73).
	Birth of Amṛita-lāl Basu, Bengali actor and playwright. (p. 176).
	Birth of Madhu-sūdan Rao, Oriya writer (p. 180).
1854	Educational Despatch, No. 49, dated July 19, drafted by Sir Charles Wood (p. 49).
	Department of Public Instruction formed (Madras) (p. 73).
	Parashuram Pant Tatya edits *Navneet*, an anthology of Marathi poetry (p. 186).

	Death of Abū 'Abd'ullah Husain bin Dildār 'Alī, Arabic scholar (p. 209).
	Publication of the *Vartamāndīpikā* Marathi Journal (p. 186).
1855	Death of Hansarāja, Marathi poet (p. 188).
	The Mahārājā of Burdwan petitions the Legislative Council for restraining polygamy among the Kulins in Bengal (p. 259).
	Birth of Govardhanrām Mādhavrām Tripāthi, Gujarati writer (p. 192).
1856	Śrī Rāmakṛishṇa Paramahaṁsa becomes a priest in the Dakshineśvara temple (p. 117).
	Hindu Widow's Re-marriage Act passed (July 26) (p. 278).
	Calcutta College of Engineering founded (p. 52).
	First female school in the Punjab opened at Rawalpindi (p. 77).
	Publication of the *Buddhiprakāś* (Hindi) by Munshi Sadāsukhlāl (p. 183).
	Birth of Bal Gangadhar Tilak (p. 189).
	Birth of Principal Agarkar, Marathi writer (p. 189).
1857	University of Calcutta incorporated, 24 January (p. 51).
	University of Bombay incorporated, 18 July (p. 51).
	University of Madras incorporated, 5 September (p. 51).
	Bābā Padmanji wites *Yamunā Paryaṭan*, first Marathi novel (p. 187).
	Keshab-chandra Sen joins the Brāhma-Samāj (p. 102).
	Death of Dāśarathī Ray, the Bengali poet (p. 172).
	Death of Faiz Ahmad bin Hāfiz Ghulam Ahmad, Arabic poet (p. 209).
	Publication of the *Strī-bodh*, a journal for women, in Bombay (p. 292).
	Hindu Muslim riot at Broach (p. 332).
1858	Pyārī-chānd's *Ālāler-gharer Dulāl* published (p. 173).
	The Industrial School attached to the Gun Carriage Factory becomes the Guindy College of Engineering and is affiliated to the Madras University (p. 52).
	The Overseer's School of Poona raised to the status of Poona College of Engineering and affiliated to the Bombay University (p. 52).
	The *Somaprakāśa* (Bengali) published by Dwārkā-nāth Vidyābhushaṇ (p. 243).
	Birth of Maṇilāl Nabhubhāi Dvivedī, Gujarati writer (p. 193).

	Birth of Bholā-nāth Dās, Assamese writer (p. 178).
	Death of Hari Keshavji, Marathi writer (p. 185).
1859	Lord Elphinstone writes in a minute (May 14): "*Divide et Impera* was the old Roman motto and it should be ours" (p. 321).
	Death of Īśvar-chandra Gupta, Bengali poet (p. 172).
	Death of Ānandaram Dhekial Phukan, Assamese writer (p. 178).
	Birth of Narsinhrao, Gujarati Writer (p. 193).
1860	Dīnabandhu Mitra's drama, *Nīla-darpaṇa*, published (p. 175).
	Rev. Long imprisoned for the publication of an English translation of the *Nīla-darpaṇa* (p. 175).
	University education begins in U.P. by affiliating the Colleges with the Calcutta University (p. 76).
	Lahore Medical School founded (p. 78).
1861	Indian Councils Act passed.
	Birth of Rabindra-nath Tagore (p. 177).
	Alexander Cunningham begins regular archaeological exploration (p. 466).
	Michael Madhu-sūdan Datta composes the *Meghnāda-vadha-kāvya* (p. 172).
	Rādhā-Soāmi-Satsaṅg founded by Tulsī Rām (p. 138).
	The *Bombay Times* changes its name to *Times of India* (p. 242).
	The *Indian Field* published by Kishorī-chānd Mitra (p. 241).
	The *Mukherji's Magazine* published by Śambhu-chandra Mukhopādhyāyā (p. 241).
	Keshab-chandra Sen becomes a whole time missionary of the Brāhma Samāj (p. 102).
	Birth of Kālī-prasanna Kāvyaviśārad (p. 177).
	Death of Hariś-chandra Mukherji, editor, *Hindoo Patriot* (p. 241).
	Death of Muhammad Fazl-i-Haqq, Arabic Scholar (p. 210).
1862	Keshab-chandra Sen becomes the Āchārya of the Brāhma Samāj (p. 102).
	Devendra-nāth Tagore publishes the *Indian Mirror* (p. 241).
	Lahore University College incorporated as a University (p. 78).
	The *Bengalee* published by Girish-chandra Ghosh (p. 241).
	First M.A. degree conferred by the Calcutta University (p. 69).
	Publication of the *Induprakāśa*, Marathi Journal (p. 186).

Ranchodbhāi Udayrām writes the first modern Gujarati play *'Jayakumārī'* (p. 192).
Birth of Rev. N. V. Tilak, Marathi poet (p. 189).

1863 Birth of Svāmī Vivekānanda (January 12) (p. 123).
Patna College established (p. 68).
Umesh-chandra Datta starts the *Bāmābodhinī*, a Journal for Women, in Bengal (p. 65).
Birth of Dwijendra-lal Rāy, Bengali playwright (p. 173).
Birth of V. K. Rajwade, Marathi writer (p. 189).

1864 Bankim-chandra Chatterji publishes his first work, the *Rājmohan's Wife* (English) (p. 174).
Canning College founded at Lucknow (p. 74).
Government Colleges established at Lahore and Delhi (pp. 77-78).
The *Śikshādarpaṇa O Sambādasāra* (Bengali) published by Bhudev Mukhopadhyay (p. 243).
The Indian Whipping Act passed (p. 350).
Birth of Kshīrod-prasād Vidyābinod, Bengali playwright. (p. 176).
Birth of S. M. Paranjpe, Marathi writer (p. 189).
Birth of Mrs. Kāminī Rāy, Bengali poetess (p. 173).
Birth of Hari Narayan Apte, Marathi writer (p. 187).

1865 Bankim's *Durgeśanandinī* published (p. 165)
Calcutta College of Engineering amalgamated with Presidency College (p. 52).
Hook-swinging prohibited (March 15) (p. 283).
The *National Paper* published by Nabogopāl Mitra (p. 241).
The *Pioneer* published (p. 242).
London Indian Society formed (p. 520).
Krishṇa-Śāstrī Chiplunkar completes the Marathi tr. of the *Arabian Nights* (p. 187).
Birth of Akshay-kumār Barāl, Bengali poet (p. 173).
Birth of Bālmukund Gupta, Hindi Journalist (p. 183).
Birth of Ayodhyā Singh Upādhyāy 'Hari Audh', Hindi writer (p. 183).

1866 Keshab-chandra Sen organizes the Brāhma Samāj of India (p. 103).
Dar-al-'Ulum founded at Deoband (p. 142).
Government starts girls' schools (Madras) (p. 74).

Formation of the East India Association with which The London Indian Society was amalgamated (p. 520).

Publication of the *Utkala Dīpikā* (p. 180).

Lakshman Moreshwar Halbe writes the *Ratnaprabhā*, Marathi novel (p. 187).

Birth of Keshavasuta Kṛishṇaji Keshav Damle, Marathi poet (p. 189).

1867 Prārthanā Samāj inaugurated in Bombay (p. 106).

Beginning of the Hindu Melā (p. 472).

Poona Sārvajanik Sabhā founded (pp. 517, 521).

National Indian Association founded in England by Mary Carpenter (p. 521).

W. C. Bonnerjee delivers a speech on "representative and responsible Government of India" in England (July 25) (p. 499).

Ravji-Śāstrī Godbole translates the *Robinson Crusoe* into Marathi (p. 187).

Birth of Manishankar Ratnaji Bhaṭṭ, Gujarati author (p. 194).

1868 The *Amrita Bazar Patrika* published by Sisir Kumar Ghosh (February 20) (p. 244).

The *Madras Mail*, the first evening paper in India, published (p. 242).

Naro Sadashiv Risbud composes *Mañjughóshā* (Marathi) (p. 187).

M. M. Kunte writes the pseudo-epic poem, the *Rājā Shivājī* (p. 189).

Birth of Lakshmī-nāth Bezbaruā, Assamese writer (p. 179).

Birth of Ramaṇbhāi Mahipatrām Nīlkanṭh, Gujarati writer (p. 195).

1869 Surendra-nāth Banerji disqualified for the I.C.S. (p. 453).

Sir Syed Ahmad Khan visits England (p. 148).

Branches of East India Association opened at Bombay, Calcutta, and Madras (p. 520).

Dwārakā-nāth Gānguli starts the Journal *Abalā-bāndhava* (p. 65).

Birth of Balvantrāi Kalyāṇrāi Ṭhakor, Gujarati writer (p. 194).

Death of Mufti Sadr-ud-din, Persian poet (p. 213).

Death of Ghālib, Persian and Urdu poet (p. 212).

1870 Dādābhāi Naoroji points out that the average annual income of an Indian was 40 Shillings (p. 422).

R. G. Bhandarkar and M. G. Ranade join the Prārthanā Samāj (p. 106).

Punjab (formerly Lahore) University College inaugurated (p. 78).

Law School founded at Lahore (p. 78).

Lahore Medical School raised to the status of a College (p. 78).

Rājkumar College at Rajkot opened (p. 78).

Naro Sadashiv Risbud composes *Vishwāsrāo,* (Marathi novel) (p. 187).

Sir Syed Ahmad starts the *Tahzibal-Akhlāq* (p. 144).

Birth of Mahābīr Prasād Dvivedī, editor of the Hindi Journal *Sarasvatī* (p. 184).

Death of Kālī-prasanna Siṁha, Bengali translator of the *Mahābhārata* (p. 177).

1871 Parliamentary Committee appointed to inquire into the financial administration of India under the Chairmanship of Henry Fawcett (pp. 392, 519).

Lord Mayo's resolution on the backwardness of Muslim Education (p. 79).

Hindu-Muslim riots in U.P. (p. 326).

A branch of the East India Association formed in Bombay (p. 516).

Publication of the *Orissa Patriot* and the *Utkalahitaishiṇī* (p. 180).

Rāma-chandra Bhikaji Gunjikar writes *Mochangaḍ,* Marathi historical novel (p. 187).

1872 Bankim-chandra publishes the *Baṅgadarśana* (p. 176).

Ānanda-mohan Bose founds the Indian Society in London (p. 521).

First public stage opened in Calcutta (p. 175).

Mayo College opened at Ajmer (p. 78).

Rajkumar College opened at Nowgong (p. 78).

Muir College (U.P.) founded (p. 76).

Native Marriage Act (popularly known as Civil Marriage Act) passed (p. 104).

Birth of N. C. Kelkar, Marathi writer (p. 189).

Birth of Madhavanuj, Marathi poet (p. 189).

Birth of Vināyaka Karandikar, Marathi poet (p. 189).

1873 Death of Michael Madhu-sūdan Datta (p. 172).

Death of Dīnabandhu Mitra, Bengali playwright (p. 175).

In Brighton, Ānanda-mohan Bose advocates gradual establishment of representative Government in India (p. 499).

Kṛishṇa-Śāstrī Chiplunkar and his son translate the *Raselas* into Marathi (p. 187).

Publication of the *Utkala-Darpaṇa* (monthly) and *Utkala-Putra* (fortnightly) (p. 180).

Arts College established at Jaipur (p. 78).

Morobā Kanhobā Vijaykar writes *Ghāshirām Kotwal*, Marathi historical novel (p. 187).

Death of Ranchoḍbhāi Girdharbhāi, Gujarati writer (p. 190).

Death of Viṭhoba Annā Daftardār, Marathi poet (p. 188).

Death of Maulvi Karamat Ali, Persian writer (p. 213).

1874 Birth of Sursinhji Gohel, *alias* Kalāpi, Gujarati writer (p. 194).

Death of Dr. Kirtikar B. D. Palande, Marathi poet (p. 188).

Death of Aru and Toru Dutt (p. 216).

Death of Babar Ali Anis, Urdu poet (p. 214).

Death of Aḷiya Liṅga Rājā, Sanskrit and Kannada writer (p. 201).

Death of Rāmalinga Swāmigal, Tamil poet (p. 196).

Death of Parashurām Balwant *alias* Parashurām Pant Tatya Godbole, Marathi writer (p. 186).

Hindu-Muslim riot in Bombay (p. 326).

Publication of *Nibandhamālā* of Vishṇuśāstri Chiplunkar (p. 186).

1875 Dayānanda founds the Ārya Samāj at Bombay, (April 10) (pp. 107, 109).

Madame Blavatsky founds the Theosophical Society in U.S.A. (p. 131).

Syed Ahmad Khan establishes a school at Aligarh (p. 76).

Prince of Wales (later Edward VII) visits India (p. 428).

The *Statesman* published by Rebert Knight (p. 242).

Robert Knight purchases the *Friend of India* (p. 242).

'Indian League' started in Calcutta (September 23) (p. 500).

Death of Salāmat 'Alī Dabīr, Urdu poet (p. 214).

Birth of D. K. Ghate, Marathi poet (p. 189).

1876 A new regulation is passed lowering the age limit of competitors for the I.C.S. examination (p. 501).

The *Civil and Military Gazette* published (p. 242).

Fuller, an English lawyer, kills his groom and is let off on payment of a fine of Rs. 30/ (p. 358).

Aru and Toru Dutt's *A Sheaf Gleaned in French Fields* published (p. 216).

Birth of Śrīdhar Pāṭhak (p. 183).

1877 Surendra-nath Banerji tours India propagating the message of unity (p. 502).

'National Mohammedan Association' founded by Amīr 'Alī (p. 311).

Lord Lytton lays the foundation stone of the Muhammadan Anglo-Oriental College at Aligarh (January 8) (p. 308).

House of Commons passes a resolution urging the abolition of the import duty on British cotton goods in India (p. 426).

The Indian Association holds a public meeting protesting against the new regulation lowering the age of the I.C.S. candidates (March 24) (p. 501).

A Durbar is held at Delhi (p. 525).

Ten principles of the Ārya Samāj promulgated (p. 110).

Madhvas of South India form an association (p. 135).

Dwijendra-nāth Tagore publishes the Journal *Bhāratī* (p. 177).

Hindu-Muslim riot at Janjira (p. 332).

1878 The Vernacular Press Act passed (March 14) (p. 503).

The Arms Act and the License Act passed (p. 503).

Sādhāran Brāhma Samāj founded by Śivanāth Ṣāstrī and Ānanda-mohan Bose (May 15) (p. 105).

The *Hindu* (weekly) published (September 20) by G. Subramaniya Aiyar and Viraraghavacharia (p. 248).

Death of Surendra-nath Majumdar, Bengali poet (p. 173).

1879 Duties on imported cotton goods from England abolished (p. 426).

Lāl-mohan Ghosh addresses the members of the Parliament in Willis's Rooms, House of Commons (July 23) (p. 504).

Formation of the rules of the Statutory Civil Service (July 24) (p. 505).

Surendra-nath Banerji takes over the management and editorship of the *Bengalee* (January 1) (p. 246).

Death of Chintāmani Péthkar, Marathi poet (p. 188).

1880 Birth of Prem Chand, Hindi novelist (p. 183).

Calcutta College of Engineering shifted to Sibpur (p. 52).

Mirza Ghulam Ahmad publishes the *Barāhīni-Ahmadiya* (p. 146).

1881	Svāmī Vivekānanda meets Śrī Rāmakṛishṇa Paramahaṁsa (p. 123).
	Lahore Central Training College for Teachers opened (p. 78).
	Publication of the *Baṅgabāsī* (p. 246).
	The *Tribune* published by Sardar Dayal Singh Majeetia (p. 243).
	The *Késarī* and the *Mahratta* published (January 4 and 2) (pp. 186, 250).
	Birth of Chāma Rāja Wodeyar (p. 202).
1882	Lord Ripon repeals the Press Act of 1857 and 1878 (p. 250).
	Inland Emigration Bill passed (p. 597).
	Punjab University (Lahore) incorporated (October 14) (p. 53).
	Appointment of Hunter Commission on education (p. 53).
	A.O. Hume retires from Government service (p. 529).
	Kerala Varmā translates the *Śākuntalam* into Malayalam (p. 206).
	Birth of Brij Narain Chakbast, Urdu poet (p. 215).
	Death of Dādoba Paṇḍurang Tarkhadkar, Marathi grammarian (p. 185).
	Death of Vishṇu Kṛishṇa-śāstribuwa Chiplunkar, Marathi writer (pp. 189, 476).
1883	Death of Svāmī Dayānanda (p. 110).
	First National Conference held at Calcutta (December 28, 29, 30) (p. 512).
	A.O. Hume addresses an open letter to the graduates of the Calcutta University (March 1) (p. 539).
	Government passes a resolution declaring its policy on Muslim Education (p. 80).
	W.S. Blunt tours India (p. 346).
	Ilbert Bill controversy (p. 506).
	Publication of the *Sañjibanī* (Bengali) (p. 246).
	The *Hindu* converted into a tri-weekly (p. 248).
	Death of Pyārī-chānd Mitra, Bengali author (p. 173).
1884	Death of Keshab-chandra Sen (January) (p. 469).
	Death of *Bhāratendu* Hariś-chandra (p. 182).
	Government passes a resolution on Muslim Education (p. 80).
	The Liṅgāyat Education Association formed (p. 136).
	The 'Mahājan Sabhā' of Madras founded (May 16) (p. 517).
	B. M. Malabari publishes his *Notes on Infant Marriage and Enforced Widowhood* (p. 283).

The Government of India approves the recommendations of the Hunter Commission (p. 55).

1885 Inauguration of the Bombay Presidency Association (January 31) (p. 516).

Second session of the National Conference held at Calcutta (December 25, 26, 27) (p. 513).

Indian National Congress holds its first session at Bombay (December 28) (pp. 514, 536).

The Government of Transvaal passes an Act imposing disabilities on Indians (p. 619).

Death of 'Alī Abbas of Chirayyakot, Arabic scholar (p. 211).

Gunabhiram Baruā publishes the *Assam Bandhu* (p. 178).

Lord Randolph Churchill advocates a Royal Commission of Enquiry into Indian Affairs (p. 388).

Hindu-Muslim riot at Lahore and Karnal (p. 327).

1886 Death of Śrī Rāmakṛishṇa Paramahaṁsa (August 16) (p. 120).

Aitchison College founded at Lahore (p. 78).

The Indian Association sends Dwarkā-nāth Ganguly to inquire into the conditions of the garden-labourers of Assam (p. 597).

Death of Akshay-kumār Datta (p. 176).

Death of Narmadā-shankar Lālshankar, Gujarati writer (p. 191).

Death of Bholānāth Sārābhāi, Gujarati writer (p. 192).

Death of Abdul Hayy, Arabic scholar (p. 210).

1887 Hindu-Muslim riots at Delhi (p. 327).

Tilak becomes the sole editor of the *Keśarī* (p. 250).

Allahabad University incorporated (p. 76).

'Deva Samāj' founded by Śiva-nārāyaṇ Agnihotri (p. 139).

Govardhanrām publishes the first volume of his (Gujarati) novel *Sarasvatī-chandr* (p. 192).

K. Vīrēśaliṅgam's *Rājaśékhara-charitramu* tr. into English (pp. 198-99).

Publication of the *Oḍiā* (weekly) (p. 181).

Death of Raṅgalāl Bandyopādhyāya (p. 172).

Death of Lālā Śrinivāsa-dās, Hindi playwright (p. 183).

Death of Faiz'ul Hasan, Arabic scholar (p. 211).

1888 Dufferin defines the British policy towards Indian aspirations at the St. Andrews Day Dinner (November 30) (p. 556).

Congress establishes a paid agency in England (p. 563).
Beck forms the 'United Indian Patriotic Association' (p. 312).
Agarkar publishes the *Sudhārak* (p. 186).
D. A. V. School in Lahore raised to the status of a College (p. 78).
Death of Navalrām Lakshmīrām, Gujarati writer (p. 192).

1889 The British Committee of the Indian National Congress founded (July) (p. 563).
Charles Bradlaugh introduces a Bill for setting up democratic government in India (p. 312).
Chandu Menon writes *Indulekhā*, a Malayalam novel (p. 205).
Paṇḍitā Ramābāi starts the Sāradā Sadan (p. 266).
The *Hindu* becomes a daily (p. 248).
The *Jonāki* published in Assam (p. 178).
Death of Mufti Syed Muhammad 'Abbās, Arabic and Persian poet (p. 211).
Hindu-Muslim riots at Hoshiarpur, Ludhiana, Ambala, and Dera Ghazi Khan (p. 327).

1890 Ranade inaugurates the 'Industrial Association of Western India' (p. 486).
C. V. Raman Pillai writes the Malayalam novel *Mārttāndavarma* (p. 205).
Death of Robert Knight (p. 242).

1891 Death of Īśvar-chandra Vidyāsāgar (p. 173).
Death of Rājendra-lāl Mitra (p. 176).
Death of Madam Blavatsky (8 May) (p. 134).
Age of Consent Act passed (p. 283).
Tilak becomes sole proprietor of the *Késarī* and the *Mahratta* (p. 250).
Mirza Ghulam Ahmad proclaims himself to be the Mahdi (p. 146).
Publication of the *Utkala-prabhā* (p. 181).
Death of V. J. Kirtane, Marathi playwright (p. 188).
Death of Mahipatram Rupram, Gujarati writer (p. 192).
Hindu-Muslim riot in Palakod (Madras) (p. 327).

1892 Indian Councils Act passed (p. 548).
Split in the Ārya Samāj (p. 111).
Islamia College, Lahore, opened (p. 78).
Death of Gopāl Hari Deshmukh *alias* Lokhitawādi, Marathi writer. (p. 189).

1893 Vivekānanda attends the Parliament of Religions at Chicago (p. 127).
Beck forms the 'Muhammadan Anglo-Oriental Defence Association of Upper India' (p. 312).

	Tilak organizes the Ganapati festival (p. 578).
	Anti-Cow killing riot in Bihar (p. 333).
	Hindu-Muslim riots in U.P., Bombay, Punjab (p. 327).
	Arts College established at Jodhpur (p. 78).
1894	Death of Bankim-chandra Chatterji (p. 173).
	Death of Bhudev Mukhopadhyay (p. 173).
	Death of Rājakrishna Rāy, Bengali playwright (p. 175).
	Death of Chāma Rāja Wodeyar (p. 202).
	Death of Bihārī-lāl Chakravarti, Bengali poet (p. 173).
	Death of Muhammad Ibrāhim Zauq, Urdu poet (p. 214).
1895	Tilak organizes the Śivājī festival (March 15) (p. 579).
	Death of Principal Agarkar, Marathi writer (p. 189).
	The 'Advaita Sabhā' of Kumbhakonam started (p. 136).
	Death of Guṇābhirām Baruā (p. 178).
1896	Famine in Bombay (p. 577).
	Death of Hem-chandra Baruā, Assamese writer (p. 178).
1897	Plague epidemic in Bombay (p. 591).
	Rand and Ayerst murdered in Poona (June 22) (pp. 581, 590).
	Tilak sentenced to 18 months' rigorous imprisonment (July 22) (p. 582).
	Vivekānanda returns to India (p. 128).
	Publication of the *Utkala Sāhitya* (p. 181).
	Khalsa College, Amritsar, founded (p. 78).
	Hindu-Muslim riot at Calcutta (p. 334).
1898	S. M. Paranjpe publishes the *Kāl* (p. 186).
	Nadwat at'Ulama founded at Lucknow by Shibli Numani (p. 142).
	Death of Sir Syed Ahmad (p. 320).
	Death of Maṇilāl Nabhubhāi Dvivedī (p. 193).
	Rajkumar College, Nowgong, amalgamated with Daly College, Indore (p. 78).
1899	Vivekānanda establishes a Maṭh at Belur (p. 129).
	Vivekānanda re-visits America (p. 130).
	Lord Curzon appointed Viceroy (p. 400).
	The two Dravid brothers, who informed against the Chapekar brothers, murdered by Vāsudev Chapekar (February 8) (p. 592).
	Death of Principal Beck (p. 314).
	Death of D. K. Ghate, Marathi poet (p. 189).
	Death of Rāj-nārāyan Basu (p. 176).

1900	Vivekānanda returns to India (p. 130). V. D. Savarkar starts the 'Mitra Melā, at Nasik (p. 592). The *Indian Review* published by G. A. Natesan (p. 250). Death of Sursinhji Gohel, *alias Kalāpi*, Gujarati writer (p. 194). Death of the Sanskrit poetess, Lakshmī (p. 166). Death of Amīr Ahmad Mīnāī, Urdu poet (p. 214).
1901	Death of Appayāchārya, Tamil philosopher (p. 164). Death of Mahadev Govind Ranade (p. 486). Publication of Phakir-mohan's *Chha-māna Aṭa-Guṇṭha* (Oriya novel) (p. 179).
1902	Death of Vivekānanda (July 4) (p. 130). Indian Universities Commission (p. 57). Śrī-Vaishṇavas of Mysore forms an association (p. 135).
1903	Death of Hem-chandra Bandyopādhyāy, Bengali poet (p. 172).
1904	Indian Universities Act passed (March 21) (p. 58). Curzon announces two principles regarding public appointments in India (p. 40).
1905	'Servant of India Society' founded (p. 496). Nānālāl writes the *Vasantotsav* (Gujarati) (p. 195). Death of Nandshankar Tuljāshankar, Gujarati writer (p. 192). Death of Mirzā Khān Dāgh, Urdu poet (p. 214). Death of Keshavasuta—Krishṇaji Keshav Damle, Marathi poet (p. 189).

INDEX

Abalābāndhava, 65.
'Abbās, Mufti Syed Muhammad, 211, 213.
Abbot, Col., 77.
Abbott, G. F., 349.
Abd-el-Latif, 301.
Abd-el-Rahman, 301.
Abhinava Bhārata, 593.
Abhyankar, Raghunāth-Śāstri, 188.
Abul Fazl, 20, 212.
Abyssinian War, 488.
Academic Association, (or Institution), 40.
Act (1872), 283.
  „ (1885), 619.
  „ (1895), 617, 623.
  „ No. 8 (1896), 623.
  „ I (1882), 597, 598, 600, 603, 605, 608, 609.
  „ V (1837), 614.
  „ XIII (1859), 596, 609.
  „ XIII (1864), 615.
  „ XV (1842), 614.
  „ XV (1856), Hindu Widow's Re-Marriage), 278, 282.
  „ XXXII (1837), 614.
Adam, 17, 19, 44, 63, 75, 230, 232, 235.
  „ Report on Vernacular Education, 17, 27f, 61, 285, 286.
  „ William, 99, 447.
Advaita Sabha, (Kumbakonam), 136.
Adyar, 134, 526.
Afghanistan, 303, 322, 373, 428, 519.
Afghan War, Second, 253.
Africa, 83, 371, 613.
Agarkar, Gopal Ganesh, 186, 189, 250, 476.
Age of Consent Bill, 244, 283.
Agnihotrī, Śivanārāyaṇ (*Satyadeva*), 139.
Agra, 27, 74, 75, 77, 81, 182, 225, 243, 358, 405, 502, 510.
  „ College, 74.
Agra Messenger, 226.
Ahalyā Bāi, 288.
Ahl-i-Hadis, (People of the Apostolic tradition), 145.
Ahl-i-Qur'ān, (People of the Qur'ān), 145.
Ahladi, 599, 600.
Ahmadabad, 58, 109, 190, 513.
Ahmadis, (Qadianis), 145.
  See also Ahmad, Mirza Ghulam.
Ahmad Ali al-Zabīdi, Shaikh Muhammad bin, 210.
Ahmad, Faiz bin Hāfiz Ghulām, 209.
Ahmad, Khādim, 210.
Ahmed, Maulvi, 301.
Ahmad, Maulavi Rashid, 213.
Ahmad, Mirza Ghulam, 145, 146.
Ahmad, Mohammad Ghaus Sharf' ul Mulk bin Nizāmuddin, 209.
Ahmad, Dr. Nazir, 144, 145, 147f, 215.
Ahmad, Saiyid, 141, 142.
Ahmadiya, (Movement), 134.
Ahmadnagar, 72, 164.
Ahmad, Sir Syed, *See Khan.*
Aitchison, Sir Charles, 77.
Aitchison College, (Lahore), 78.
Aiyar, G. Subramaniya, 248.
Ajmer, 53, 64, 78, 243.
Akbar, (Emperor), 140, 268.
Akhbār-o-Soudāgar, 226.
Al-Afghani, Jamal-ud-din, 303, 304.
Al-Bīrūnī, 89, 171.
Al-Zamakhshari, 210.
Ālambāzār, 129.
Alaṅkāra Śāstras, 19.
Albert Hall, 500, 513.
Albuquerque, 268.
Alexander, 76.
Alf-i-Sāni, Mujaddid, 140f.
'Ali 'Abbas, Maulavi, (of Chirayyakoli), 211.
'Ali Abū' Abd'ullah Husain bin Dildār, 209.
Ali, Justice Ameer, 303.
Ali, Amir, 299, 301, 302.
'Ali, Dildār, 209f.
'Ali, Amjad, 211.
'Ali, Hāji Imdād, 213.
Ali, Maulavi Charagh, 146.
'Ali, Maulavi Karāmat, 213.
Ali, Mir Ghulam, 143.
'Ali, Muhammad, 211, 320.
Allahabad, 74, 119, 238, 315, 316, 348, 502, 513, 514, 544, 546.
Allahabadi, Akbar, 145.
Aligarh, 76, 144, 148, 311, 312, 320, 502.
Aligarh College, 298, 324.
Aligarh College Magazine, 313.
Aligarh Movement, 215, 295, 305, 308, 314, 317, 325, 327, 328.
  See also Khan Sir Syed Ahmad.
Alivardi Khan, 2, 5, 23.
Amarakosha, 19.
Ambala, 368, 327.
Ambedkar, Dr., 323.
America, 37, 74, 127, 129, 130, 131, 136, 153, 266.
American War of Independence, 434.
Amherst, Lord, 34, 43, 44, 234, 271, 286.
Amman, Mir, 147.
Ampthill, Lord, 372.
Amraoti, 582.
Amrita Bazaar Patrika, 7, 244, 245, 248, 252, 253, 357, 388, 484, 503.
Amritsar, 502, 510.
Anandamath, 478.
Anderson, 197, 279.
Andrews, 613.
Anglo-Oriental College, (Aligarh), 80.
Anjuman (Dindigal), 317.

Anjuman-i-Islamia, The, (Madras), 317.
Anīs, Babar 'Alī, 214.
Annapūrṇā, 285.
Antahpura, 65.
Anti-Cow-Killing Society, 579.
Anstey, 376.
Anuśīlam Samiti, 593, 594.
Anwari, 212.
Appayāchārya, 164.
Appar, 196.
Apparāo, Gurajāḍa, 200.
Apte, Hari Nārāyan, 187, 188, 189.
Aqīqa, 149f.
Arbuthnot, 608.
Arden, 200.
Argaon, 28.
Aristotle, 20.
Arms Act, 313, 429, 503, 513.
Arnold, Edward, 215.
Arnold, W.D., 61, 62, 77.
Arts Colleges, 52.
Arabic College, (Calcutta, Delhi), 45, 145.
Arts College, (Jaipur), 78.
Arts College, (Jodhpur), 78.
Aruṇodaya Samvād Patra, 178.
Ārya Bāndhav Samāj, 593.
Āryadarśana, 243.
Ārya Mahilā Samāj, 266.
Ārya Prakāś, 110.
Ārya-Samāj, 66, 78, 107, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 137, 139, 154, 183, 264, 266, 268, 376, 475.
Ārya Vidyālaya, 110.
"Ārzū" Sirājuddin 'Ali Khan, 214.
Asan, Kumaran, 207.
Asiatic Enquiry Commission, (1920), 620.
Asiatic Mirror, 223.
Asiatic Society, (The), 48, 405.
Asoka, 466.
Assam, 166, 178, 595, 596, 597, 601, 602, 604, 605, 608, 609, 610, 611.
Astell, William, 45.
Assye, (Battle of, 1803), 28.
Ātish, Haidar 'Ali, 214.
Ātmīya Sabhā, 98, 224.
Auckland, 48, 63, 342.
Auddy, Gaurmohan, 34.
Audi Alteram Partem, 544.
Aurangazeb, 142f, 313, 326, 330, 407, 479.
Australasia, 83.
Australia, 420, 624.
Ava, 530.
Avadh, 74, 140, 211, 246, 298.
Ayerst, Lieut, 581, 590.
Āyilyam Tirumāl, 164.
Azad, Ghulam Ali, (of Bilgram), 208.
Azād, Maulavi Mohammad Husain, 147f, 215.
Azamgarh, District, 327.
'Aziz, Shāh 'Abd'ul, 209.
Bābā, Pāhārī, 139.
Bābāji, Santadās, 139.
Bacon, Lord, 34, 35, 39, 68, 92.
Badāunī, 212.
Bāgdi, 285.
Bahadur, Maharaja Kali-Krishna, 274.
Bahadur, Nawab Syed Mahomed, 315.
Bahadur Shah II, 140.
Bahar Danish, 20.
"Bahār", Munshi Tek Chand, 213.
Baji, 590.
Baji Rao, The Peshwa, 268.
Baker, Sir E.N., 413, 414.
Bakhtyar, Khalji, 479.
Bāḷabodha, (Script), 218.
Balakoṭ, (battle), 141.
Bal, Nanda-Kishor, 180.
Balwant Parshurām, (alias Parashuram Pant Tatya Godbole), 186.
Bāmābodhinī, 65.
Banajee, F.C., 292.
Banaras, 74, 75, 97, 108, 119, 130, 137, 163, 182, 276, 318, 326, 348, 502.
Bandemataram, 478, 575.
Bandyopādhyāy, Hem-Chandra, 172, 173.
Bandyopādhyāy, Indra-nāth, 177.
Bandyopadhyay, Jatindra-nath, 593.
Bandyopādhyāy, Raṅgatal, 172.
Banerji, Babu Tara-pada, 511.
Banerjee, Chaṇḍī-charan, 177.
Banerji, Gauri Charan, 233.
Banerjee, Mr. Justice, Gurudas, 57, 593.
Banerji, Hemchandra, 479, 480.
Banerji, Rev. K., 286.
Banerji, Rev. K.M., 289.
Banerji, Sasipada, 65, 278.
Banerji, Surendra-nath, 58, 103, 243, 246, 249, 309, 316, 430, 453, 454, 481. 482, 483, 484, 485, 486, 499, 500, 501, 502, 503, 504, 510, 511, 512, 513, 514, 525, 526, 527, 532, 533, 534, 535, 539, 548, 563, 571.
Banga Bhasa Prakasika Sabha, 444, 446.
Baṅgabāsi, 246.
Baṅgadarśana, 243.
Baṅgādhipa-parājaya, 481.
Bain, 365.
Bankipore, 513.
Bannerjee, Kali Charan, 545.
Baptist Mission College, 33.
Barāhnagar Patrika Samāchār, 346.
Barāl, Akshay-kumār, 173.
Barānagar, 125, 126, 129, 599.
Barānagore *Maṭh*, 126.
Baranī, 212.
Baraset, 290.
Barelvi, Syed Ahmad, 149.
Bareilly, 141, 326.
Bareilly College, 74.
Barnes, Archdeacon, 190.
Baroda, 267, 593.
Barr, Sir Darvid, 345.
Baruā, Guṇābhirām, 178.

Baruā, Hem-chandra. 178.
Barua, Sasadhar, 604.
Basava Purāṇa, 201.
Bassein, 72.
Basu, Amṛita-lāl, 176.
Basu, Ānanda-mohan, 482. 511.
Basu, Chandra-nāth. 177.
Basu, Rājnārāyan, 91. 176. 177.
Basu, Rāmrām, 167.
Bayley, W.B., 230, 231.
Beadon, Sir Cecil. 283.
  „ Resolution, (1865), 283.
Beck, Theodore. 311. 312. 313. 314, 320. 324.
Bedil, 212.
Behrampore, 68. 598.
Bell, Dr. Andrew, 74.
  (Madras System). 74.
Bellary, 73.
Bengalee, 241, 246, 441, 598.
Bengal, 1, 2, 4, 5. 6. 8, 9, 10. 11. 12, 16. 17, 18; 20, 21, 22, 23. 28, 31. 32, 33. 36, 41, 42, 48, 49, 55. 60, 61, 64. 67, 69. 70, 71, 73, 75, 76, 89, 91, 115, 135, 139, 151. 154, 162, 164, 165, 170, 177, 178, 224f, 231, 240, 241, 244, 245, 246, 256, 258, 261, 262, 263, 265. 269, 271, 273, 274, 275, 278, 279, 282. 284, 285, 292, 298, 301, 302. 303, 304. 315, 338, 339, 341, 347, 363. 374, 375, 418, 427, 433, 436, 441, 456, 468, 477, 495, 499, 500, 503, 504, 510, 511, 515, 527, 534, 536, 537, 540. 566, 567, 573. 593, 609, 612.
Bengal Chronicle, 443.
Bengal Gazette, 223, 224.
Bengal Hurka'ru, 239, 436, 443, 447.
Bengal Herald, *see Roy, Rājā Rām-mohan*, 170, 225.
Bengal Spectator, 38, 40, 441.
Bengali-Assamese, (Script), 218, 219. 220.
Bentham, 43, 45.
Bentinck, 44, 46, 47, 227, 234, 273. 274, 341, 405.
  Resolution, (1835),-44, 47, 48, 73.
Belur and Belur Maṭh, 129, 130, 494.
Besant, Annie, *See Theosophical Society*, 133, 134, 492, 525, 526, 560.
Bethune, Hon'ble J.E. Drinkwater, 66, 70, 291, 448.
Bethune College, 70.
Bethune School, 292.
Bezbaruā, Lakshmī-nāth, 179.
Bhagaipur, 513.
Bhagalpur, 340.
Bhāgavatā Purāṇa, 19.
Bhagavatkavi, 198.
Bhandarkar, R.G., 106, 266.
Bhañja, Upendra, 181.
Bhāratamahilā 65.
Bhārata-mihir, 243.
Bhāratī, 65, 176.
Bhārat-chandra, 172.
Bhārati, Premānanda, 136.
Bhārati, Subramania, 198.
Bhārati, Suddhānanda. 198.
Bhaṭṭi-Kāvya, 19.
Bhaṭṭ, Manishankar Ratnajī. (Kant). 194.
  Pūrvālāp, 194.
  Guru Govindsinh, 194.
  Roman Swarājya, 194.
  Ek Devinu Vṛittānt, 194.
  Vasant Vijay, 194.
  Chakravāk-Mithun. 194.
Bhavabhūti, 206.
Bhaṭṭatiri. Ārūr, 164.
Bhavānī, Rāṇī, 288.
Bhave, Vishṇu Amritu. 188.
Bhawanipore, 31.
Bhiwindi, 332.
Bhola Kachari, 608.
Bholāgiri. 139.
Bhopal. 145, 211.
Bhowanagree, 560.
Bhowanipore College. 68.
Bihar, 1, 5, 17. 18, 23, 61, 273, 315, 333.
  „ Riots, (Anti-Kine-Killing). 333.
Bijnor, 305.
Bilgrami. Ghulam 'Ali Āzād, 211.
Bilgrami, Sayyid Husain, 571.
Billingsgate, 25.
Binyon, Laurence, 217.
Birajānanda, Swāmī, 108.
Bismillāh, 149f.
Black Acts, (1849). 341, 363.
Blanchard, S.L., 239.
Blavatsky, H.P., *see Theosophical Society*. 131. 132, 133, 134.
Blunt. W.S., (Wilfrid), 248, 299, 300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 346, 347, 351, 352, 353, 354, 359. 364. 378, 396, 408, 411, 507, 513.
Boer War, 624.
Bohtlingk, 466.
Bolts, 222.
Bombay, 24. 28, 31, 48. 49, 52, 55, 60, 68, 70, 71, 72, 73. 103, 105, 109, 132, 135, 153, 154, 178, 186, 190, 224, 225, 226, 228, 231, 239, 242, 245, 246, 254, 265, 269, 274, 277, 292, 298, 315, 326, 327, 339, 346, 348, 355, 375, 397, 398, 408, 449, 453, 456, 460, 477, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, 519, 520, 522, 530, 533, 535, 536, 539. 540, 542, 547, 549, 577, 592, 614.
Bombay Association, 459, 460, 462.
Bombay Courier, see *Times of India, The*, 224, 225, 242.
Bombay Gazette, 224, 456.
Bombay Native Education Society, 70.
Bombay Herald, 224.
Bombay Presidency Association, 516.
Bombay Samāchār, 225, 239.
Bombay Standard, *see Times of India, The*, 242.
Bombay Telegraph, *see Times of India, The*, 242.
Bombay Times, *see Times of India, The*, 225. 226, 239, 241. 242.

Bonnerjee, W.C., 499, 514, 520, 530, 532, 533, 537, 545, 563.
Book and Tract Society, The, 186.
Bose, Ānanda-mohan, 105, 473, 499, 513, 521.
  Sādhāran Brāhma Samāj, 105, 107.
Bose, B.K., 571.
Bose, Dr. Jogendra-chandra, 177, 385.
Bose, Manmohan, 481.
Bose, Rājnārāyan, 103, 469, 470, 472, 473.
Boston, 136.
Bradlaugh, Charles, 312, 390, 518, 547, 563.
Brahmachārī, Vishnubuwa, 189, 458.
Brāhmaism, 115.
Brahmānanda, Swāmī, 129.
Brahmanical Magazine, (1821), 15.
Brāhma Samāj, *see Roy, Raja Ram Mohan*, 65, 90, 92, 94, 97, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 109, 112, 114, 123, 130, 134, 139, 154, 155, 192, 201, 256, 264, 277, 283, 468, 474, 486, 545, 597.
  programme of Social reforms, 104.
  Sulabh Samāchār, 104.
Brāhmī, (Script), 218.
Bramley, Dr. M.T., 69.
Branson, 507.
Briggs, Lt. General, 37.
Bright, 574.
Bright, John, 389, 390, 393, 394, 420, 455, 504, 518, 543, 553.
Brighton, 521.
British Guiana, 613, 614.
British and Foreign School Society of England, 285.
British India Advocate, 447.
British Indian Association, (Society), 53, 241, 277, 297, 298, 328, 341, 448, 449, 450, 451, 452, 453, 454, 455, 459, 504, 539, 565, 566.
British Rule, (in Bengal), 1, 4, 5, 10, 11, 23, 31, 37, 168, 184, 219, 222, 236, 237, 265, 311, 312, 322, 325, 358, 394, 572, 587, 612.
  Reaction of the people, 2-3.
  Economic consequences, 2.
  Political changes, 2.
  Attitude of the Hindus, 3-4.
  Attitude of the Muslims, 5-6.
  Hindu-Muslim cleavage, 6-10.
  Liberal character, 11-12.
  Education in Bengal, 17-20.
  Social Evils, 21-26.
  Social relation between the Europeans and the Indians, 26-28.
  Divide and Rule policy, 320-325.
Broach, 70, 190, 332.
  Riot, (1857), 332.
Bronson, 178.
Brougham, Lord, 614.
Brown, 40, 607.
Brown, C.P., 200.
Browne, Lieut. H.R., 607, 608.
Brown, William, 200.
Brown, Major, 77.
Bruce, Robert, 582.
Brutus, 320.
Bryce, Dr., 232.
Bryan, Jennings, 415.
Buckley, 346.
Buckingham, James Silk, 230, 232, 434.
Buddhiprakāś, 191.
Buist, George, 239.
Burdwan, 19, 97.
"Burhān", Muhammad, Husain, 212.
Burma, 52, 53, 64, 160, 428.
Burmese War, Third, 253.
Bux, Mowla, 249.
Byculla, 72.
Byculla Club, 408.
Bāṅgāl Gejeṭi, 274.
Baṅga-dūta, *see Bengal Herald*.
Bābā Bhārati, *see Bhārati Premānanda*.

Cāchār, 166, 387, 606.
Caesar, 580.
Calcutta, 18, 22, 26, 28, 31, 32, 33, 34, 38, 42, 43, 45, 48, 52, 59, 60, 66, 68, 70, 71, 80, 98, 99, 100, 109, 116, 119, 123, 124, 129, 130, 151, 153, 154, 155, 162, 169, 171, 175, 178, 181, 183, 184, 211, 223, 224, 225, 228, 229, 232, 233, 235, 242, 244, 262, 269, 271, 273, 274, 277, 279, 284, 290, 291, 295, 297, 298, 299, 300, 301, 303, 311, 324, 328, 334, 338, 339, 341, 342, 363, 365, 368, 374, 378, 386, 392, 434, 449, 460, 500, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 508, 511, 512, 513, 518, 520, 522, 524, 525, 526, 533, 535, 537, 539, 541, 547, 555, 565, 589, 593, 599, 611, 614.
Calcutta Chronicle, 234.
Calcutta Female Juvenile Society, 285.
Calcutta General Advertiser, See Bengal Gazette.
Calcutta Gazette, 223.
Calcutta Journal, 36, 230, 232, 242.
Calcutta School Book Society, 31, 32.
Calcutta Review, 286, 374, 375, 554.
Calcutta School Society, 285.
Caldwell, Dr A., 197, 200.
Calicut, 73.
California, 130.
Cama, K.R., 135.
Cameron, Charles Hay, 49, 461.
Campbell, A.D., 61, 64, 200, 201.
Campbell, Sir George, 69, 246, 247, 425.
Canada, 420, 422.
Candy, Major, 186.
Canning, Lord, 74, 238, 239, 455.
Canning College, (Lakshnau), 74.
Cape Comorin, 128.
Carbonari, 484, 589.
Carey, William, 151, 167, 168, 184, 200, 201, 242, 343.
Carlyle, 469.
Carnaticus, 321.
Carpenter, Frank G., 413.
Carpenter, Mary, 521.

Cashmere, *see Kashmir*.
Cawnpore, 238, 250, 371, 349, 502.
Central Muhammadan Association, The, 329.
Ceylon, 218, 421, 552, 553.
Chailley, Joseph, 60, 340, 349, 355, 376, 378, 415.
Chaitanya, (Cult), 118, 135.
Chakbast, Brij Nārāin, 215.
Chakravarti, Bihāri-lāl, 173.
Chakralavi, Maulvi Abdullah, 145.
Chakravarti, Tarachand, 40, 41, 99, 100, 441, 442, 448.
Chamberlain, 620.
Chamberlain, Neville, 373.
Champaran, 334.
Chandernagore, 269.
Chaṇḍidās, 172.
Chandra, Bhola-nath, 342.
Chandra, Dēva, 201.
Chandra, Dr. Suresh, 357.
Chapekar, (brothers), 581, 590, 591, 592.
Chapekar, Balkrishna, 591.
Chapekar, Damodar, 590, 592.
Chapekar, Vasudev, 592.
Chaplin, Hugh, 72.
Chaplin, William, 70.
Chapman, 245.
Chapra, 334, 361.
Charaka-pūjā, (Hook-swinging), 22, 282, 283.
Charaka Saṁhitā, 165.
Charlu, P.A., 571.
Charter Act, (1833, 1840, 1953), 15, 42, 49, 152, 153, 280, 284, 383, 399, 421, 448, 451, 455, 518.
Chārvāka, 90.
Chatterji, Bankim Chandra, 5, 115, 116, 136, 162, 170, 173, 174, 176, 202, 208, 217, 243, 260, 263, 345, 478, 479, 487, 496, 567.
  Krishṇacharitra, 136.
  Rājmohan's Wife, 174.
  Bangadarśana, 176.
Chatterji, Dr. N.L., 535, 536.
Chatterji, Sarat-chandra, 479.
Chatterji, Dr. S.K 160.
Chaṭṭopādhyāy, Nagendra-nāth, 177.
Chatushpāṭhis, 17.
Chaudhuri, Sir Ashu-tosh, 588.
Chellapiḷḷa, 198.
Chenna Basava Purāṇa, 201.
Chesney, General, 556.
Chettiār, Tyāgarāja, 197.
Chicago, 126, 489.
Chicago Daily Tribune, 127.
Chilianwala, 483.
China, 131.
Chinnayasūri, 199.
Chinsura, 31, 269, 285.
Chiplunkar, Kṛishṇa-śāstri, 187, 189.
Chiplunkar, Vishṇu Kṛishṇa-Śāstri-bhuwa, 189, 476.
Chiplunkar, Vishṇuśāstri, 186, 250.
Chitale, M.B., 188.
Chitnis, M.R., 185.
Chittagong, 503.
Chirol, Valentine, 579.
Chhandombudhi, 201.
Chowdhury, J., 363.
Christian College, (Madras), 74.
Churchill, Lord Randolph, 388, 553.
Civil Marriage Act, (Native Marriage Act), 104, 105.
Citizen, 226.
Clive, (Lord), 3, 14, 23.
Cobden, 420, 445, 543, 574.
Cochin, 163, 164, 166, 202, 204.
Coke, Lt. John, 321.
Coldbath, Fields, 394.
Colebrooke, 268.
  Digest of Hindu Law, 268, 269.
College of Engineering, (Calcutta), 52.
College of Engineering, (Guindy), 52.
College of Engineering, (Poona), 52, 72.
College of Engineering, (Roorkee), 52, 76.
Collet, Miss S.D., 107, 232.
Columbus, 127.
Colvin, Sir Auckland, 544, 545, 546, 556, 559.
Colvin, School, (Lakhnau), 78.
Conceicao, Dr., 604.
Congress Catechism, A, 544.
Congress, *See Indian National Congress*.
Congress of Socialists, The, (at Amsterdam), (1904), 564.
Conjeevaram, *See Kāñchī*.
Connemara, Lord, 384.
Conspiracy, (1757), 3.
Constantinople, 304.
Convention of London, 620.
Cooch-Behar, 105, 116.
Cooke, Miss, *See Mrs. Wilson*, 285, 286.
Coorg, 387.
Corbett, 361, 362.
Cornwallis, Lord, 23.
Cotton, Sir Henry, 344, 345, 350, 353, 354, 355, 357, 358, 359, 469, 502, 518, 519, 553, 611.
Council Act of 1892, 384.
Council of Education, 49, 66, 68, 79, 291.
Cowan, 359, 360, 361.
  "Cowan Case", 359.
Cranbrook, Lo[illegible]
Cranganore, 16[illegible]
Crimean (Wars), 148.
Croesus, 129.
Croft, Sir Alfred, 55.
Cross, Lord, 253, 254, 322, 324, 325, 384, 385, 402, 533, 541, 554, 555, 556, 558, 559, 561.
Cuddalore, 72, 73.
Cumming's Calcutta Academy, 44.
Cunningham, Alexander, 466.
Cunningham, Justice, 608.
Curzon, Lord, 56, 57, 59, 60, 251, 253, 362, 365, 366, 367, 369, 370, 371, 372, 384, 385, 386, 394, 399, 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 408, 560, 561, 562, 610, 611.

Cuttack, 513.
Cutch, 276.

Dabīr, Salāmat 'Alī, 214.
Dacca, 68.
Daftardār, Viṭhoba Annā, 188.
Dāgh, Nawāb Mirzā Khān, 214.
Ḍāhyābhāi, Dalpatrām, 190, 191.
dā'is, 147 f.
Dakshina Prize Committee, The, 186.
Dalhousie, Lady, 292.
Dalhousie, Lord, 49, 52, 66, 70, 76, 280, 292, 386, 394.
Daly, Sir Henry, 78.
Daly College, (Indore), 78.
Dakshinesvar, 117, 118, 119, 123, 124.
Dār-al-'Ulūm, 142.
Darbhanga, 513.
Darjilling, 508.
Darogas, 291.
Darpaṇ, 186.
Dars-i-Nizami, 208.
Dārul-'Ulūm, 212.
Das, Bholā-nāth, 178.
Das, C.R., 593.
Das, Malik Bhagavan, 540.
Dātākarṇa, 18.
Datta, Akshay-Kumār, 102, 176, 442.
Datta, Aswini-Kumar, 567.
Datta, Madhusudan, 154, 172, 173, 174, 175, 177, 178, 179.
  Captive Ladie, 174.
  Śarmishṭhā, 175.
  Kṛishṇakumārī, 175.
Datta, Rameshchandra, 175, 233.
Datta, Umesh-chandra, 65.
Dattakamīmāṁsā, 19.
Daulatrām, Paṇḍit, 182.
Dāyabhāga, 19.
Dayananda, (See Saraswati, Dayanand).
Dayanand Anglo-Vedic School, 78, 111.
Dayārām, 190.
Deccan Sabhā, 521.
De Boigne, 27.
De, Harinath, 386.
Deccan Education Society, 66.
Delhi, 28, 61, 74, 75, 77, 78, 141, 143, 181, 209, 214, 225, 268, 303, 312, 327, 371, 512, 513.
Delhi Ākhbār, 225.
Delhi College, 74, 76.
Delhi Durbar, (1877), (1903), 369, 519, 525.
Delhi Gazette, 226.
Deoband, 142.
Deoghar, 513.
Deologni, 600.
Dera Ghazi Khan, 327.
Derby, Lord, 618, 619.
Derozio, Henry Louis Vivian, 38, 39, 40, 90, 216, 434, 435.
Derozians, 40.
  Hesperus, 40.
  Inquirer, 40.
  The Quill, 40.
Deshmukh, Gopal Hari, 457, 476.
Despatches, 43, 44, 48, 72, 74.
Dev, Raja Rādhākānta, 32, 44, 100, 165, 272, 274, 285.
Dev, Chandra Sekhar, 99.
Deva, Rājā Padmanābha Nārāyaṇa, (of Parlakimedi), 180.
Deva Samāj, (See Agnihotri, Śiva-nārāyaṇ). 139.
Devadāsīs, 267 f.
Deval, Govind Ballāl, 188, 189.
Devanāgari, *see Nāgarī*.
Dharamsi, A.M., 538.
Dharma Sabhā, 100, 277.
Dharwar Dramatic Company, 199.
Dholśāji, Ḍahyābhāi, 195.
Dhubri, 598, 599, 600.
Dhulia, 325.
Dibrugarh, 598, 600, 603, 604.
Dickens, Theodore, 438.
Dickinson, John, 455.
Digby, (John), 6, 97, 98, 346, 518.
Digby, William, 563.
Digdarśana, 169, 186, 224.
Dikshithar, Muthuswāmi, 203.
Dinapur, 371.
Diron, (tea estate), 607.
Disraeli, 253.
Djemal ed Din, 303.
Dodwell, Prof., 51.
Dooab, 27.
Doveton, 68.
Dravid, (brothers), 592.
Drummond, 434.
Dubois, Abbe, 62, 150, 267f8. 268.
  Letters on the State of Christianity in India, 150.
Duff, Dr., 68. 443.
Duff, Rev. Alexander, 33, 40, 49, 155.
  'India & Indian Missions', 155.
Dufferin, Lord, 252, 253, 254, 322, 323, 324, 325, 384, 385, 386, 530, 531, 532, 534, 535, 541, 543, 545, 546, 547, 554, 555, 556, 557, 558, 559, 561, 562, 570.
Dukhin, Babu, 41.
Dum-Dum, (tea estate), 604.
Duncan, 276.
Duncan, Jonathan, 42.
Durban, 623.
Durbīn, 239.
Durgesh-nandini, 479.
Durham, Lord, 420.
Dutt, Aru, 216.
Dutt, Govinda-Chandra, 452.
Dutt, M.N., (Michael Madhu-Sūdan), 136, 216.
Dutt, Romesh Chunder, 216, 217, 424, 425, 427, 571.
Dutt, Toru, 216, 217.
Dvivedī, Mahābīr Prasād, 184.
Dvivedī, Maṇilāl Nabhubhāi, 193, 195.
  Sudarśan Gadyāvali, 193.
  Ātma-Nimajjana, 193.
  Kāntā, 193.
  Gulābsinh, 193.
  Bālavilāsa, 193.
  Siddhāntsāra, 193.

Dygoreon, (tea garden), 604.

East, Sir Hyde, 32, 33.
East India Association, 422, 423, 520.
East India Company, 3, 40, 42, 43, 49, 65, 97, 140, 143, 152, 153, 166, 167, 222, 225, 232, 234, 242, 280, 341, 385, 396, 399, 409, 421, 432, 455, 550.
East Indian, 435.
Eastern Star, 226.
Eden, Sir Ashley, 507.
Education Commission, (1882), 66.
Edward VII, 428, 479.
Egypt, 210, 299.
Egyptian Expedition, 391.
Egyptian War, 299, 300, 304.
Éknāth, 185.
Ellenborough, Lord, 302, 322, 381, 383, 386, 393, 450.
Elgin, Lord, 304, 325, 383, 385, 398, 400, 560.
Elphinstone College, 70f, 72, 190, 292.
Elphinstone, Lord Mountstuart, 37, 70, 71, 73, 228, 236, 321, 382, 406, 556.
Emancipation Act, The, 280, 281.
Emerson, 469.
Emigration Act, 604.
Emigration Report, (1883), 605.
Englishman, (Newspaper), 12, 39, 226, (John Bull), 242, 251, 397, 500, 553.
Etawah, 243.
Ettrick, 361.
Euclid, 20.
Eyre, 361, 605.

Faizī, 212.
Fandi, Anant, 184.
Farangi Mahal, 142, 210.
Farhang-i-Jahāngiri, 213.
Farhang-i-Rahīdi, 213.
Farīd, Khwaja, 143.
Fawcett, 392, 393, 394, 426, 518, 519, 520, 553.
Fazl-i-Imām, 210f.
Fergusson, 466.
Ferid-ed-din, 356.
Fielding, 192.
Fiji, 613.
Firishta, 212, 268.
Fisher, H.A.L., 217.
Forsyth, 360, 361.
Forbes, 31.
Forbes, A. Kinlock, 190, 191.
Fort William College, 20, 465.
Fort William, 371.
Fowler, Sir Henry, 414.
France, 228.
Francis, 604.
Fraser, Lovat, 60.
French Revolution, 434.
Friend of India, The, See Statesman, The, 226, 239, 242.
Fuller, Sir Bampfylde, 364, 365, 605, 608, 610.
Fuller Case, 358, 361.
Fulta, 3.
Furdunji, Naoroji, 461.
Furreduddin, Maulvi, 544.
Fyzabad, 510.
Ferguson, (College), 72.
Fort William College, (Calcutta), 166, 182.

Gandhi, Mahatma, 95, 428, 453, 474, 566, 575, 613.
Gaṇeśa, 165.
Gaṅgādhara, 164.
  Gītagovinda, (imitations), 164.
  Saṅgītarāghava, 164.
  Gaṅgāshṭapadī, 164.
Gangopādhyāy, Tārak-nāth, 175.
Ganguli, Dwaraka-nath, 65, 597, 598.
Garibaldi, 177, 243.
Garratt, 348, 350, 351, 353, 356.
Gaya, (District), 334.
Gelette, 200.
General Committee of Public Instruction, 43, 44, 48.
Gentoos, 9.
George IV, 405.
Ghate, D.K., 189.
Ghālib, (Mirza Asadullah Khan), 141, 212, 214, 215.
Ghayāsuddīn, Muhammad, 213.
Ghazipur, 306
Ghazni, 322.
Ghosal, Swarna-Kumari, 65.
Ghose, Aurobindo (Arabinda), 217, 430, 572, 573, 575, 585, 586, 592, 593.
Ghose, Harchandra, 233.
Ghose, Justice Chandra Madhab, 606.
Ghose, Kāsī-prasād, (Kashiprasad), 216, 436.
Ghose, Manmohan, (Mono-Mohan), 547, 573.
Ghosh, Girīs (Girish) Chandra, 176, 441.
Ghosh, Barindra-Kumar, 593.
Ghosh, Kālī-prasanna, 177.
Ghosh, Kedar Nath, 604.
Ghosh, Lal-mohan, 504, 505, 507, 571.
Ghosh, Ramgopal, 442, 452, 455.
Ghosh, Ram-lochan, 444, 445, 446.
Ghosh, Rash-behari, 571.
Ghosh, Sisir-Kumar, 244, 245.
Gibbons, 607.
Gilbert, Murray, 376.
Girāmi, 213.
Girasia College, (Gondal and Wadhwan in Kathiawar), 79.
Girdharbhāi, Raṇchoḍbhāi, 190.
Gladstone, W. E., 383, 384, 388, 407, 504, 549.
Gladstone, Life of, 388.
Goa, 162, 220, 268.
Goalpara, 598.
Goalundo, 600.
Godbole, Parasuram Pant, 188.
Godbole, Ravji-Śāstri, 187.
Goethe, 194.
Gogoi Pator, 608.

Gokhale, G. K., 59, 316, 402, 403, 407, 415, 416, 430, 495, 496, 522, 532, 563, 571, 582, 588, 592.
Golaghat 604.
Gold Law, No. 15 (1898), 622.
Gopal Chandra, 607.
Gordon, Lieutenant, 613.
Gosse, Edmund, 216.
Gosvāmī, Bijoy-Kṛishṇa, 139.
Government College, (Kumbakonam), 197.
Government Engineering College, (Sibpur), 69.
Government and Oriental Colleges, (Lahore), 78.
Govindāchārya Svāmi, A., 135.
Graham, Mrs., 339.
Grand Old Man, *See Naoroji.*
Grant, Charles, 23, 42, 46, 48, 62.
Grant, Sir J.P., 259, 282.
Grant Medical College, 71, 72.
Grantha—Tamil-Malayālam, (Script), 218, 220.
Greece, 1, 83, 278.
Greco-Turkish (Wars), 148.
Greenshield, 604.
Grote, Mrs., 45.
Gujarāt, 108, 110, 129, 193, 215, 276, 483.
Gujarāti, (Script), 220.
Gāyatri-mantra, 101.
Gundert, Dr., 204.
Gunjikar, Rāma-Chandra Bhikaji, 187.
Gupta, Iśvarchandra, 172.
Gupta, Madhusudan, 69.
Gupta, Maithili Saran, 183.
Gujār, Vithal Sitārām, 188.
Gurmukhi, (Script), 218, 219, 220.
Gwalior, 393.
Gyananneshun, 440, 444.

Habibullah, Wali 'ullāh bin, 210.
Hackney, 519.
Hādī, Syed, 143.
Haider, Mulla, 210.
Hafiz, 20.
Haileybury College, 461.
Halbe, Lakshman Moreshwar, 187.
Hālī, Altaf Hosain Pānipatī, 215.
Hāli, Altāf Hussain, 144f, 147f.
Halkabandi, 75f, 76, 77.
Hall, Dr. C. C., 349.
Halliday, F. G., 450, 451.
Halliday, Sir, F., 282.
Hamilton, 384, 385, 386.
Hamilton, Lord George, 251, 304, 325, 369, 370, 371, 398, 400, 401, 402, 403, 425, 560, 561, 562, 610, 611.
Hamilton, Sir Frederick, 340.
Hanafi, (School), 142, 145, 146.
Hanifa, Abū, 210.
Hansarājā, 188.
Haqq, Muhammad Fazl-i, 209.
Hardinge, Lord, 49, 276.
  Educational Despatch, (1844), 49.
Hare, Daoid, 32, 34, 36, 38.
Hari, 122.
Haridwār, 111.
Hariś-chandra, (of Benaras), 182, 183.
Harrington, J., 32, 285.
Hasan, Raja Amir, (of Lakhnau), 346.
Hasan, Maulana Faizul, 213.
Hasan, Maulavi Faiz'ul, 211.
Hasan, Nawab Siddiq, 145.
Hasan, Syed, 212.
Hastings, Marquess of, 229, 230, 231, 232, 271, 337, 405.
Hastings, The Private Journal of the Marquess of, 382.
Hastings, Warren, 2, 42, 43, 167, 223, 279.
Hayy, Maulana Abdul, 141, 210.
Heber, (Bishop), 13, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 31, 34, 44, 62, 272, 295.
Heeman, 249.
Hero Worship, 469.
Hicky, James Augustus, 223.
Hijra, 145f.
Hindī Bangavāsī, 184.
Hindī Khaṛī Bolī, 147.
Hindoo Patriot, 225, 239, 240, 241, 441, 500, 501.
Hindu, 248.
Hindu Bālikā Vidyālaya, 66.
Hindu College, (Calcutta), 7, 31, 32, 34, 38, 39, 40, 41, 43, 44, 68, 69, 71, 90, 91, 173, 295, 434, 435, 436, 439, 440, 441, 442, 444.
  Parthenon, (1830), 40.
  Gyananneshun, (1831-1844), 40.
  Hindu Pioneer, 40, 444.
Hindu Free School, 36.
Hindu-hitaishinī, 243.
Hindu Melā, 298, 328, 472, 473.
Hindu Missionary Society, 265.
Hindu Pioneer, 40, 444.
Hindu Theophilanthropic Society, *See Duff*, 40.
History of Gujarat, 458.
History of the Sepoy War in India, 395.
Hobhouse, 48.
Holwell, 14.
Holy Alliance, 434.
Homes, Captain Francis, 228.
Hooghly, 116.
Hooghli College, 68.
Hope Anthony, 216.
Hosack, 607, 608.
Hoshiarpur, 327.
Hospital, Sir Jamsetjee Jeejeebhoy, 71.
Hossainpore, 513.
House of Commons, 414, 420, 426, 504, 518, 519, 548, 549, 563, 571.
Hulett, Sir Liege, 623.
Hume, 39, 40, 123, 314, 387.
Hume, Allan Octavian, 518, 525-533, 535, 536, 543, 544, 548, 558, 559, 562, 573, 574, 575.
Hume, Joseph, 455.
Hunas, 8.
Hunter, Sir W. W., 53, 143, 613.
  Commission, 54, 55, 64, 304.

'The Indian Mussalmans', 143, 306, 322.
Hu'rkaru (Hircarrah), 223, 226.
Husain, Syed Ghulam, 340.
Hussain, Syed Amir, 299, 301.
Hussain, Maulavi Tasadduq, 214.
Hussain, Syed Nazir, 145.
Hussain, Zakir, 362.
Huseyn, Akbar, 359.
Huseyn, Delawar, 299.
Hyde, 47.
Hyderabad, 211, 345.
Hyder Ali, 432.
Hyndman, H. M., 392, 393.

Ijtihād, 147f.
Ilbert, Mr., 506.
Ilbert, Sir Courtenay, 508.
Ilbert Bill, 251, 299, 301, 302, 313, 363, 364, 397, 408, 480, 506, 507, 508, 509, 511, 512, 515, 516, 524, 526, 552.
Imām of San'ā, 210.
Imams, Hasan and Husain, 209.
Imperial Paper, The, 317.
Impey, Sir Elijah, 223.
India, 563, 564.
India Act V, 1843, (slavery), 280.
India Bill of 1853, 389.
India Office, 396, 397, 398, 405, 413, 563.
India Reform Society, 455.
India Revisited, 390.
Indian Association, (Calcutta), 310, 500, 501, 503, 504, 505, 506, 510, 511, 512, 514, 515, 527, 533, 534, 539, 597, 598, 602, 608, 609.
Indian Civil Service, 401, 409, 410, 411, 412, 414, 442, 451, 481, 501, 502, 503, 504, 507, 513, 518, 519, 527, 552, 554.
India Council, The, 548.
Indian Councils Act, (1861, 1892), 241, 323, 542, 548, 549, 570, 571.
Indian Field, 241.
Indian Gazette, 223, 382, 439, 443.
Indian Herald, 223.
Indian Immigration Restriction Act, (1897, 1903), 623.
Indian League, 500.
Indian Mirror, 241.
Indian National Congress, 58, 59, 66, 144, 251, 258, 295, 310, 314, 315, 316, 317, 319, 322, 324, 388, 389, 398, 400, 407, 408, 409, 413, 415, 421, 453, 514, 515, 516, 524-551, 553, 554, 556, 559, 560, 561, 562, 563, 565, 567, 570, 571, 572, 573, 574, 575, 577, 578, 590, 609, 623, 624.
Indian National Social Conference, 258.
Indian Review, 250.
Indian Social Congress, 66.
Indian Society, (in London), 521.
Indian Universities Act, 58, 59.
Indian Universities Commission, 56, 69f.
Indian Unrest, 579.
Indu Prakash (Prakāśa), 186, 572.
Industrial Revolution, The, 611, 612.
Inland Emigration Bill, *See Act I, 1882*, 597.
Institute Gazette, The, (Aligarh College), 311, 314, 317.
Iqbal, 149.
Iqbāl, Sir Muhammad, 215.
Iran, 146.
Irāq, 211.
Ireland, Home Rule Bill for, 384.
Isa Khel, 327.
Ishāq, Abū Sulaimān Muhammad, 209.
Islamia College, (Lahore), 78.
Ismā'il, Qāzi Muhammad, 209.
Ismā'il, Shah Muhammad, (Shahīd), 141f.
Italy, 243, 589.
Iyengar, Pandits M. and R. Raghava, 197.
Iyengar, Kasturiranga, 248.
Iyer, B. R. Rajam, 197, 217.
Iyer, Dr. V. Swāminātha (Mahāmahopādhyāya), 196, 197.

Jacquemont, 383.
Jāgir, 75.
Jahān Begum, Sultan, (The Begum of Bhopal), 148.
Jahangir, (Emperor), 140, 268.
Jaimini, 113.
Jaimini Bhārata, 201.
Jaintir, 387.
Jalpaiguri, 599.
Jamaica, 613.
Jāmbhekar, Bāl Gangādhar, 185, 189.
Jambhekar, Gangadhar Shastri, 265.
Jam-e-Jamshed, 239.
Jam-i-Jahan Numa, 225.
Jammu, 165.
Janjira Riots, (1877), 333.
Japan, 488.
Jean Marie Farina, 374.
Jekyll, 47.
Jenkins, Richard, 61.
Jentue-rajahs, 3.
Jessore, (District), 357.
Jervis, Captain George, 184, 185.
Jervis, Col., 71.
Jesuit and S.P.G. Colleges, (Trichinopoly), 74.
Jinsivale, Professor, 581.
Jñānaprakāśa, 186.
Jñānaprasārak Sabha, The, 186.
Jñānasundarī, 165.
Jñānodaya, 186.
John Bull, 444.
Jonāki, 178, 179.
Jones, William, 466.
Jones, Sir William, 215, 338.
Jorhat, 608.
Jubbulpore, 513.
Judicial System of India, 6.
Jullundur, 66.
Jumma Masjid, 405.
Jharija, (Jadeja), 276.

Kabul, 211, 322.
Kabul, (Expedition), 391.
Kaḍattanāḍ, 166.
Kalāpa, 19.
Kalāpī, (Sursinhji Gohel, Thakor of Lāṭhī), 194.
Kālicharan, 138.
Kālidāsa, 206, 208.
Kalyan Singh, 3.
Kāmārpukur, 116.
Kambakhtpur, Ram Buksh, 544.
Kāñchī, 164.
Kanchi Sabha Raoji, 135.
Kandahār, 211.
Kanpur, *See Cawnpore.*
Karandikar, Vināyaka, 189.
Karel, 201.
Karimgunge, 606.
Karimuddīn, Munshi, 214.
Karnal, 327.
Karve, Professor, D. K., 278.
Kāshināth, Sadāshiv, (alias Bapu Chhatre), 185, 187.
Kashmir, 163, 165, 219, 268, 313, 374.
Kāsi, *See Banaras.*
Kāsipur, 125.
Kāṭhiābābā, 139.
Kavasji, Dadabhai, 226.
Kavirāja, Gaṅgādhara, 165.
Kāvyaviśārad, Kālī-prasanna, 177.
Kaye, Sir John, 394, 395.
Kelkar, Prof., 250.
Kelkar, N.C., 189
Kemp, 358.
Kerala, 202, 203.
Keśarī, 250, 477, 578, 579, 580.
Keshavji, Hari, 185.
Keshavsuta, 189.
Keshavasuta—Kṛishṇaji Keshav Dāmlé, 189.
Khadilkar, Kṛishṇaji Prabhākar, 188, 189.
Khairabad, 209.
Khalsa College, (Amritsar), 78.
Khan, Afsal, 580, 581, 582.
Khan, Aga, 304.
Khan, Dehra Ismail, 540.
Khan, Haji Muhammad Ismail, 316.
Khan, Maulavi Sami'ullah, 144.
Khān, Mīr Osmān 'Ali, 213.
Khān, Mirzā, 212.
Khan, Nawab Alauddin Ahmad, 303.
Khan, Nawab Amin Hasan (of Kakori), ("Bismil"), 211, 213.
Khan, Nawab Amir Ali, 298, 311.
Khan, Nawab Mahmud, 305.
Khan, Nawab Razā Hasan, 211.
Khan, Nawab Villayet Ali, 347.
Khan, Sheik Raza Hussein, 315.
Khan, Sayyid Ghulam Hussain, 9.
Khan, Sir Syed Ahmad, 76, 80, 141, 143, 144, 146, 147f, 148, 154, 215, 298, 303, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 540, 546.
  Asaru-s-Sanadia, 215.
Khāṇḍekar, Rāghava Āpā, 164.
  Kośāvataṁsa, 164.
  Kheṭakṛiti, 164.
  Paddhatichandrikā, 164.
  Pañchāṅgārka, 164.
  Kṛishṇavilāsa, 164.
Khāqāni, 212.
Kharpade, 585, 586.
Khasi, (dialect), 221.
Khobong Garden, 600.
Khulasat-ut-Tawarikh, 3.
Khusrav, Amīr, 212.
Kidderpore, 151.
Kimberley, Lord, 619.
Kipling, Rudyard, 373, 376, 387.
Kirloskar, 189.
Kirtane, V.J., 188.
Kishore, Pandit Jugal, 183.
Kishore, Munshi Newal, 214.
Kittel, 201.
Knight, Robert, ("The Bayard of India"), 242.
Koath, 334.
Koithampuran, Vidwan, 203.
Kolhatkar, Mahādeo-Śāstri, 188.
Kolhatkar, Shripad Kṛishṇa, 188.
Konkani, (Speech), 220.
Krause, Dr., 620.
Krishnagar, 68, 511.
Kṛishṇarāja, Mummaḍi, 200, 201.
Kṛishṇamāchārya, 201.
Kruger, President, 621.
Kūchipūḍi, (School), 199.
Kuka, (rebellion), 359.
Kuli-Kāhinī, 596.
Kulīna-Kula-Sarvasva, 175.
Kulins, 22, 259, 261, 262.
Kumaran, Moorkothu, 207.
Kumbakonam, 136, 165.
Kunte, M.M., 189.
Kurup, Azhakathu Padmanābha, 207.
Kushanas, 8.
Kesari, See *Nayanar, Kunju Raman.*

Lachman Sing, 599.
Lāhiḍī, Rāhtanu, 177.
Lahore, 78, 111, 139, 147, 148, 275, 316, 327, 348, 502, 510.
Lahore Central Training College, The, 78.
Lahore Chronicle, 226.
Lahore Medical College, 78.
Lājpat Rāi, Lālā, 109, 430, 574, 585, 586.
Lakshmi, 166.
Lakshmīnarasimham, Chilakamarti, 199.
Lakshmirām, Navatram, 192.
Lakhnau, 142, 147, 209, 210, 214, 215, 315, 316, 502.
Lala, Jaganmohan, 180.
Lāl, Lallūji, (of Agra), 182.
Lal, Munshi Kundan (Ashki), 209.
Lal, Munshi Munwan (Falsafi), 209.
Lālshankar, Narmadāshankar, 191, 192.
  Pingalprakāś, 191.
  Alaṅkārpraveś, 191.
  Ras-Praveś, 191.

  - Nāyikā-Vishaya-Praveś, 191.
  - Narmakośa, 191.
  - Narmakathākośa, 191.
  - Dharm-vichār, 191.
  - Mārī Hakikat, 191.
- La Martinieré, 68, 70.
- Lancashire, 426, 551.
- Lancasterian Method, 70f.
- Landa, (Script), 218, 219.
- Landholders' Society, 446, 447.
- Lande Schools, 61f.
- Landsdowne, Lord, 384, 385, 402, 559, 622.
- Larcom, 333.
- Latif, Abdul, 298, 300, 303.
- Lāvaṇi, 201.
- Law Colleges, 52.
- Lawrence, Sir John (later Lord), 104, 321, 342, 348, 349, 388, 405, 423, 503.
- Lebedeff, Herasim, 175.
- Lee-Warner, 560.
- Lele, Gaṇeś-śāstri, 188.
- Lethbridge, Sir Roger, 414.
- License Act, 503.
- Lincoln, Abraham, 403.
- Liṅgāyat Education Association, 136.
- Linguistic Survey of India, 160.
- Liverpool, 24.
- Lloyd George, 403.
- Locke, 39, 46.
- Lodī, Sikandar, 213.
- Lokhitwādi, Gopāl Hari Deshmukh, 189.
- London, 24, 25, 127, 134, 329, 355, 370, 391, 521, 614, 616.
- London Indian Society, The, 520.
- Long, 175.
- Long Acre, 24.
- Long, Reverend James, 24, 227, 408.
- Loretto House, 70.
- Los Angeles, 130, 136.
- Lowther Castle, 546.
- Ludhiana, 225, 327, 359, 360.
- Lutchman Sing, 599.
- Luther, 92.
- Lyall, Sir Alfred, 356.
- Lyall, J.E., 69.
- Lytton, Bulwer.
- Lytton, Lord, 234, 244, 247, 250, 358, 370, 386, 399, 400, 402, 426, 427, 503, 515, 519, 524, 528, 531.
  - Minute, (1877), 247, 370.
- Lucknow, *See Lakhnau.*
- Loodhiana, *See Ludhiana.*

- Maben, 201.
- MacDonnell, 371.
- Macdonnell, Sir Anthony, 561.
- Macaulay, Lord, 23, 33, 36, 37, 45, 46, 47, 48, 227, 236, 383, 387, 394, 406, 507.
  - Minute on Education, 46, 47, 81.
- Mackenzie, Col., 200.
- Macnaghlen, 232.
- Madgaonkar, G.N., 189.
- Madagascar, 613.
- Madrasa-i-Jawādiya, (Banaras), 147.
- Mādhavānuj, 189.
- Madhaviah, 198, 217.
- *Madrasas*, 8, 17, 42, 68, 69, 144, 208, 298.
- Madras, 28, 31, 49, 52, 55, 60, 61, 66, 72, 73, 74, 98, 103, 107, 109, 129, 134, 152, 178, 196, 201, 202, 223, 225, 228, 229, 231, 246, 247, 248, 250, 269, 274, 278, 284, 298, 315, 316, 318, 327, 329, 338, 339, 344, 371, 372, 378, 433, 449, 453, 460, 462, 512, 513, 514, 515, 517, 519, 520, 525, 526, 530, 536, 540, 541, 542, 549, 551, 560, 614.
- *Madras Courier*, 223.
- *Madras Mail*, 242.
- Madras Native Association, 248, 452, 462.
- *Madras Spectator*, 226.
- *Madras United Services Gazette*, 226.
- Madrisa-i-Qadīma, 142.
- Madura, 267.
- Ma Gun, 366.
- Mahājan Sabhā, 517.
- Māgha-Kāvya, 19.
- Mahājan, Bhan, 186, 189.
- Mahākanyā Vidyālaya, 66.
- Mahmud, Syed, 521.
- Mahānubhavas, 185.
- Morley, John, *See Morley, Lord.*
- Mahārāja's College, (Trivandrum), 206.
- Maharaja of Darbhanga, 546.
- Maharaja of Mysore, 559.
- Mahārāni Swarnamoyee of Bengal, 504.
- Mahīdhara, 113.
- Mahitā, 65.
- Mahomed, Nawab Syed, 317.
- *Mahomedan Observer, The*, 317, 324.
- *Mahratta*, 250, 591.
- Maithili, (Script), 218, 219, 220.
- Majeetia, Sardar Dayal Singh, 243.
- Majnun, 62.
- "Majrūh", Mir Mahdi, 213.
- Majuba Hill, 617.
- Majumdar, Śrīś-chandra, 175.
- Majumdār, Surendra-nāth, 173.
- Makhzin, 147.
- *Maktabs*, 17.
- Malabar, 162, 202, 204.
- Malabari, Behramji Merwanji, 217, 283.
- Malcolm, Sir John, 43, 71, 274.
- Maldah, (District), 151.
- Malaviya, Madan Mohan, 571.
- Malleson, 395, 541.
- Mallik, Madhab-chandra, 36.
- Mallik, Rasik-Krishna, 438, 440, 442.
- Manchester, 389, 427, 563.
- Mandalik, V.N., 189.
- Mandlik, 348.
- Māṇikkavāchakar, 196.
- *Maṇipravāḷa*, (Style), 205, 206.
- Manipur, 166.
- Manipur, (Outbreak), (1891), 251.
- Mannadiyar, Chathukkutty, 206.
- Manu, 19.
- M.A.O. College, 148.
- Marriot, Saville, 424.

Marsh, 152.
Marshman, J.C., 169, 224, 242, 272, 343.
Martin, Montgomery, 225.
Marx, Karl, 455.
Mathur, Babu, 120.
Mathurā, 76, 183, 184.
Māthurī, 19.
Maulvi, A.M., 300.
Mauritius, (Ile de France), 613, 614, 615, 616.
Mazar-ul-Haq, Maulvi, 315.
Mazzini, 177, 243, 482, 483, 484, 593.
Mazumdar, A.C., 462, 509.
Māyavaram, 166.
May, Mr., 285.
Mayo, Lord, 78, 79, 143, 361,
Mayo College, (Ajmere), 78.
McLeod, 605.
Mecleod, Sir Donald, 78.
Meares, Gerald, 357, 358.
Medical College, (Bombay), 52.
Medical College, (Calcutta), 52, 69.
Medical College, (Madras), 52, 74.
Medical School, (Lahore), 52.
Meerut, 316, 502, 513, 514.
Megasthenes, 278.
Mehta, Sir Pherozeshah, 58, 326, 327, 397, 430, 515, 516, 533, 539, 547, 571, 573.
Melaṭṭūr Tyāgarāja, 199.
Menon, Chandu, 205.
Menon, C.P. Achutha, 207.
Menon, Kundoor Nārāyaṇa, 208.
Metcalfe, 61, 228, 234, 235, 236, 237, 273, 274, 556.
  Press Law, (1835), 234.
Midlothian, 411.
Military Gazette, (of Lahore), 242.
Mill, 424, 433.
Mill, James, 43, 44, 45, 465.
Mill, John Stuart, 123, 227, 235, 337, 338.
Milton, 68.
Mīmāṁsā, 35.
Mīnāī, Amīr Ahmad, 214.
Minto, Lord, 229, 325, 340. 373, 411.
Miran, 23.
Mirat, 309, 316.
Mirāt-ul-Ākhbār, 225, 226, 234.
Mir Jafar, 2, 3, 14.
Mir Qasim, 3.
Mirror, 534.
Misra, Kampala, 180.
Miśra, Paṇḍit Sadal, 182.
Mitāksharā, 19.
Mithilā, 163.
Mitra, 113.
Mitra, Basanti, 66.
Mitra, Dīnbandhu, 175, 480.
Mitra, Digamber, 260.
Mitra, Kishori-chand, 241, 452.
Mitra, Krishna-kumar, 597.
Mitra, Kumudini, 66.
Mitra, Mehṭa, 592.
Mitra, Naba-gopal, 241, 472, 473.
Mitra, P., 593.
Mitra, Peary-chand, 39, 328, 450, 451, 452.
Mitra, Pyārī-chānd, 167, 173.
Mitra, Rājendra-lāl, 176, 466, 540.
Mizan, (Prosody), 20.
Modak, Achutarāya, 164.
Moderate Party, 407, 429, 583.
Modi, (Script), 218.
Moegling, 201.
Mahammedan Literary Society, 298, 317.
Mohamedan Nation, 317.
Mohsin, (endowment), 68.
Mohsin, Hāji Muhammad, 298.
Mohsin-ul-Mulk, Nawab, 318.
Moirra, Lord, 62.
Molesworth, 185, 186.
Molière, 192.
Monghyr, 24.
Montgomery, (I.C.S.), 579.
Montagu, 561.
Montgomery, Sir Robert, 77, 152.
Moradabad, 144, 321.
Morley, Lord, 373, 387, 388, 411, 561.
Morning Post, 251.
Morris, 200, 358.
Morrison, Mr., 312, 314.
Morrison, Sir Theodore, 357.
Mudaliyār, Prof. Chēlvakesavarāya, 197.
Mudaliyār, Ranganātha, (Professor) 197.
Mudaliyār, Sambanda, 198.
Mudaliyār, Subramania, 196.
Mudaliyār, Tāṇḍavarāya, 196.
Mukherji, Ashu-tosh, 571.
Muhammadan, Anglo--Oriental College, 144, 308, 311, 314.
Muhammadan Anglo-Oriental Defence Association of Upper India, 312, 313, 314, 317.
Muhammadan Central Association, The, (Punjab), 317.
Muhammadan Educational Congress, 144f, 308, 317.
Muhamud of Ghaznī, Sultan, 215, 477.
Muhammad Ghuṛi, 477.
Muhammad ibn Qāsim, 477.
Muhuri, 288.
Muir Central College, 76.
Mujtahids, 147f.
Mukherjee, Baidyanath, 33.
Mukhopādhyāy, Bhūdev, 116, 177, 243, 465.
Mukherji, Haris-chandra, 225, 239, 241.
Mukherji, Jay-krishna, 260, 540.
Mukherji's Magazine, 241.
Mukhopadhyay, Dakshina-ranjan, 40, 440, 452.
Mukhopādhyāy, Rājīb-lochan, 167.
Mukhopadhyaya, Sambhu-chandra, 241.
Mukundarām, 172.
Mūla Saṅkara, *See Dayanand Saraswati*.
Mulji, Karsondas, 266.
Müller, Max, 127, 215, 466.
Multan, 503.
Múmin, Muhammad Mu'min Khān, 214.

Munroe, Sir Thomas, 43, 61, 62, 73, 75, 228, 236, 238, 382, 406, 556.
Munshi, 194.
Murshidabad, 3, 4, 19, 20, 97, 130.
Murshidabad School, 7.
Murshid Quli Khan, 5.
Mushin'ul-Mulk, 144.
Muslim Herald, The, 317.
Mutiny, 74, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 240, 242, 259, 281, 283, 305, 309, 313, 319, 321, 322, 332, 350, 352, 353, 420, 455, 592.
Muttaqi, Mir, 143.
Muzaffarpur, 513.
Mymensingh, 243.
Mysore, 135, 163, 165, 200, 201, 267, 387.

Nabobs, The, 377.
Nadia, 19, 20.
Nadīyā, 163.
Nadwat al-'Ulama, 212, 213.
Naga, (dialect), 221.
Nāgarī, (Script), 218, 219, 220, 221, 318.
Nagpur, 61, 164, 513.
Nair, Sankaran, 586, 590.
Naishada-Kāvya, (love of Nala and Damayantī), 19.
"Naiyar", Nawab Ziyā'uddīn, 213.
Nambūdini, (of Mahishamaṅgalam), 165.
Namjoshi, 250.
Nampoodiris, Venmani, (the Senior and the Junior), 205, 206.
Nanak, 485.
Nānālāl, 194, 195.
Nānā Sāheb, 164.
Nānauta, Maulana Muhammad Qasim, 213.
Nanda-Nandana, 115.
Nanjappa, Muddagiri, 201.
Nanjuṇḍa, Devatāpurada, 201.
Naogaon, 598.
Naoroj, Dadabhai, 134, 226, 326, 327, 329, 330, 392, 393, 398, 399, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 459, 461, 515, 520, 527, 533, 539, 541, 548, 563, 564, 571.
Napier, Lord, 361.
Naples, 434.
Napoleon, 228, 580.
Napoleonic War, 613.
Narasayya, Phakki Veṇkaṭa, 198.
Nārāyaṇa, Kempu, 201.
Narasiṁhāchārya, S.G., 202.
Narendranath, *see Vivekānanda, Swami.*
Narsingh, 361, 362.
Narsinhrāo, 193, 194.
  Kusummālā, 193.
  Hṛidayavīṅā, 194.
  Nūpurjhaṅkār, 194.
  Smaraṇsaṁhitā, 194.
  Manomukur, 194.
  Abhinayakalā, 194.
  Vivartlīkalā, 194.
  Smaraṇ Mukur, 194.
  Premānandanā-nāṭako, 194.
Nasik, 72, 592.
Nāsikh, Imām Baksh, 214.
Natal, 617, 622, 623.
Natesan, G.A., 250.
Nath, Pandit Ayudhya, 546.
National Mohammedan Association, 298f, 301, 311, 317, 328.
National Conference, 310, 512, 513, 514, 525, 526, 527, 528, 532, 533, 534, 535.
National Indian Association, The, 521.
National Paper, 328, 472, 473.
National Society, 298.
Nationalities and Subject Races, Congress on, 376.
Nationality Promotion Society, 470, 471, 472.
Natore, (Rajashahi district), 61.
Natu, 590, 591.
Navabābu-vilāsa, 91.
Nāvalar, Ārumuga, 196.
Nawab of Avadh, (Oudh), 342.
Nawab of Bengal, 2, 13.
Nawab of Janjira, 333.
Nawab of Murshidabad, 2.
Nawab Sadat Ali, 31.
Nawab Shamsudaula, (of Dacca), 31.
Nawab Wazir, 3.
Nayanar, Kunju Raman, 207.
Nāzimiya College, 147.
Nazir, 288, 291.
Naziri, 212.
Nazīr, Muhammad, (of Agra), 214.
Nedungadi, Appu, 205.
Negapatam, 150.
Neill, General, 350.
Nepal, 218, 219.
Nepali, Kessur Sing, 599.
New India, 586.
Newāri, (Script), 218, 219, 220.
New York, 130, 134, 136.
  Vedānta Society, 130.
New York Daily Tribune, 455.
Newton, 46.
Nibandhamāla, 186, 189.
Nicholson, John, 348, 349.
Nightingale, Florence, 553.
Nila-darpana, 480.
Nīlkaṇṭh, Ramaṇbhāi Mahipatrām, 195.
  Bhadraṁbhadra, 195.
  Rāino Parvat, 195.
  Hāsyamandir, 195.
  Kavitāe Sāhitya, 195.
Nineteenth Century, 392.
Nāraṇappa, Nandaḷige, 202.
Nirañjanī, Rāmprasād, 182.
Nizāmi, Darsi, 142f.
Niyāz, Munshi Sadāsukhlāl, 182.
Niyoga, 258.
Noakhali, 362, 363.
Noble, C.F., 3.
Noble, Margaret, *see Sister Niveditā.*
Noman, M., 316.
Norris, Mr. Justice, 510.
Northbrook, Lord, 79, 247, 361, 426.
Norton, Eardley, 563.
Notes on the evidence on Indian Affairs, 450.
Nu'māni-Shibli, 142, 145, 213, 215.

Oḍiā, 181.
Official Secrets Acts, 407.
O'Gara, 368.
Olcott, Col. H.S., *see Theosophical Society*, 131, 132.
Old Bailey, 25.
Olivier, Lord, 613.
Ordinance, XXII, (1847), 615.
Ordinance, XXXI, (1867), 615.
Oriental Seminary, 34.
Orissa, 1, 180, 220, 273, 282.
Oriyā, (Script), 218, 220.
O'Sullivan, 368.
Oudh Punch, 147f.
Oudh, *see Avadh*, 540.
Oriental College, (Delhi), 74.

Pachayyappa's College, (Madras), 74.
Padmanji, Bābā, 187, 189.
Pai, Nagesh Viśa-nāth, 217.
Pakistan, 10, 160, 318.
Pal, B.C., (Bipin Chandra), 115, 303, 304, 305, 430, 452, 468, 473, 475, 479, 480, 481, 482, 484, 486, 491, 492, 544, 545, 585, 586, 593.
Pal, Krishto-das, 241, 500.
Pāl, Rāmsaran, 139.
Palakod, 327.
Palamkottah, 72, 136.
Palande, Dr. Kīrtikar, B.D., 188.
Palasi, *see Plassey*.
Pallavas, 220.
Pall Mall Gazette, 247.
Pandit, Sakharam, P., 187.
Paṇḍita, Chārukīrtī, 201.
Paṇḍita, Śāntarājā, 201.
Paine, Tom, 39.
  Age of Reason, 39.
Pandenamath, 20.
Paṇḍitia, Lālā, 165.
Pandurang, Dr. Ātmārām, 106.
Pāṇḍuraṅg, Balwant, (alias Kirloskar, Annā Sāheb), 188.
Pāṇini, 19.
Panipat, The Third Battle, 330.
Paramahaṁsa Sabhā, 265.
Paramahaṁsa, Śivanārāyan, 137.
Paranjpe, S.M., 186, 188, 189.
Paris, 127, 134.
  Congress of the History of Religions, 130.
Parliament of Religions, (World Congregation), 126, 127, 489.
Parthenon, 444.
Parvate, Raghunātha Śāstri, 164.
  Padabhūshaṇa, 164.
  Sāṅkarapādabhūshaṇa, 164.
Pāṭhak, Śrīdhar, 183.
Pather-Dabi, 479.
Pathsala, Kayastha, 545.
Patna, 97, 347, 348, 589.
Patna College, 68.
Patwari, 288.
Paul, Herbet, 414.
Payagambar, 21.
Pearson, 613.
Pennel, 362, 363, 365.
Periclean, 1.
  Athens, 1.
  School of Hellas, 1.
Perkins, Colonel, 360.
Perron, 27.
Perry, Sir Edward, 71, 72.
Perso-Arabic, (Script), 220.
Peshwar, 503.
Péthkar, Chintāmani, 188.
Phadke, Wasudeo Balwant, 495, 589.
Phukan, Ānandarām Dhekial, 178.
Phule, Jotiba, 189, 265.
Piḷḷai, Dēsigavināyakam, 198.
Piḷḷai, Dewan Bahadur, A. Govinda, 208.
Piḷḷai, Kanakasabhai, 197.
Piḷḷai, K.C. Kesava, 207.
Piḷḷai, Krishṇa, 196.
Piḷḷai, K.R. Krishna, 207.
Piḷḷai, Mīnākshisundaram, 196, 197.
Piḷḷai, Nallaswāmi, 197.
Piḷḷai, P.K. Nārāyaṇa, 207.
Piḷḷai, Nāmakkal Rāmalingam, 198.
Piḷḷai, C.V. Raman, 205.
Piḷḷai, Saravana, 198.
Piḷḷai, Sundaram, (Professor), 197, 198.
Piḷḷai, Vēdanāyakam, 197.
Pindaris, 28.
Pioneer, (*of Allahabad*), 242, 251.
Pirs, 21.
Plassey, battle of, 1, 2, 3.
Plato, 20.
Plevna, 249.
Policy of Education, 31-67.
  English Education, 31-42.
  British Policy towards Education, 42-48.
  Progress of English Education, 55-60.
  Primary Education, 60-65.
  Female Education, 65-67.
Poona, 186, 265, 268, 278, 449, 453, 521, 525, 576, 580, 581, 590, 592.
Poona College of Science, 72.
Poona Sanskrit College, (Deccan College), 70, 72.
Porteus, 606.
Potti, C.S. Subramanian, 208.
Poverty and Un-British Rule in India, 423.
Prabhākar, 186, 189, 445, 458.
Prabuddha Bhārata, 129.
Pradhān, Bajaba, 188.
Prajā-bandhu, 252.
Prārthanā Samāj, *see Sen, Keshabchandra*, 66, 103, 106, 107, 109, 134, 256, 265.
Pratāp, Rāṇā, 495.
Pratāpasiṁha, (Rājā of Satara), 165.
Pratt, Mr. Hodgson, 291.
Prayāg, (see Allahabad).
Prem Chānd, 183.
Presidency College, (Calcutta), 52, 74.
Presidency College, (Madras), 74.
Press Law, (1835), *see Metcalfe*, 234.

Press Ordinance, (1823), 232, 233, 234, 235, 437.
Press Regulation, 4, 13.
Pretoria, 617.
Pretoria Convention, 617, 618.
Prinsep, 46, 48, 62, 466.
Progress of Education, 67.
  Bengal, 67-70.
  Bombay, 70-72.
  Madras, 72-74.
  Uttar Pradesh, (United Provinces), 74-77.
  Punjab, 77-78.
  Chiefs' Colleges, 78-79.
  Muslim Education, 79-81.
Ptolemy, 20.
Pulavar, Umaru, 196.
Punch, 376.
Punjab, 49, 61, 66, 77, 110, 140, 145, 183, 298, 325, 327, 503, 510, 540.
Punjab, University College, 78.
Puṇyastambha, 164.
Puri, 153.
Purneah, 19.

Qadian, 146f.
Qadir, Shah Abdu'l, 147.
Qatil, 212.
Quarterly Journal, 552.
Queen's Proclamation, *see Royal Proclamation*.

Rabindranath, *see Tagore*.
Rādhā Soāmi Satsang, (The), 138.
Rādhānagar, 97.
Rafiq-i-Hind, The, 317.
Rafi'uddin, Shāh, 209.
Raghunandana, 19.
Rahnumai Mazdayasnan Sabhā, 134.
Raikes, Charles, 322.
Raily, 363.
Raipur College, 78.
Rajbansi, 276.
Rāja, Aḷiya Liṅga, 201.
  Narapati-Charita, 201.
  Prabhāvatī-pariṇaya, 201.
  Vīrabhadra-śataka, 201.
  Mahāliṅga Śataka, 201.
Rājaballabh, Rājā, 277.
Rajabarie, 605.
Raja of Burdwan, 20.
Rāja-Guru, Śyāma-sundara, 180.
Raja Nabakrishna, 3.
Rājarājavarma, 136.
Raja Shiva Prasad, 546.
Rajahmundry, 73.
Rajashahi, 20.
Rājendra Nāmā, 201.
Rajkumar, 276.
Rajkumar College, (Nowgong), 78.
Rajkumar College, (Rajkot), 78.
Rājwade, Kṛishṇa-Śāstri, 188.
Rājwade, V.K., 189.
Raleigh, Sir Thomas, 57.
Ramābāi, Paṇḍitā, 266.
Rāmakṛishṇa Paramahaṁsa, (Thākur), 116f, 123, 124, 125, 126, 128, 137, 138, 176.
Rāmakṛishṇa Maṭh, 116, 129, 130.
Ramakrishna Mission, *see Vivekananda*, 129, 130, 135.
Ramakrishna Order, *see Vivekananda*, 126, 130.
Rāmakṛishṇa-Vivekānanda Doctrine, 131.
Rāmakṛishṇayya, P., 200.
Rāmānuja, 135.
Rāmdās, 184.
Rampur, 214.
Rāṇā Pratāp, *see Pratāp, Rāṇā*.
Ranade, Justice, 538.
Ranade, Mahādev Govind, 106, 256, 257, 258, 265, 266, 268, 476, 486, 492, 515, 521, 522, 578.
Raṇchhoḍbhāi, 191, 192.
Rand, 581, 582, 590, 591.
Rangāchārlu, 202.
Raṅgāchārya, Paravastu Veṅkaṭa, 165.
Rangalal, 479.
Rangoon, 366, 368, 373.
Rangpur, 98.
Rāṇā Pratāp, 330.
Rast Goftar, (Truth-teller), 134, 135, 226, 239, 326.
Rao, Sir Madhava, 556.
Rāo, Madhu-sūdan, 179, 180.
Rāsmaṇi, 117, 121.
Rasul, A., 315.
Rawalpindi, 77.
Rāy, Dāśarathi, 172.
Rāy, Dwijendra-lāl, 173, 176.
Ray, Hara-chandra, 224.
Rāy, Mrs. Kāminī, 173.
Rāy, Rādhā-nāth, 179, 180, 181.
Rāy, Rām-Śaṅkar, 180.
Reay, Lord, 384, 561.
Recollections, (by Morley), 411.
Reeve, 201.
Regulation, The, (1772, enslavement), 278, 279.
Regulation VI, (1802, Infanticide), 276.
Regulation III, (of 1818), 411.
Regulation XVII, (Sati, 1829), 273, 275.
Reid, 40.
Reid, Captain Blair, 77.
Religious Sects, 139.
  Kabīr-panthīs, 139.
  Dādū-panthīs, 139.
  Rādhāballabhis, 139.
  Daṇḍīs, 139.
  Daśanāmis, 139.
  Yogis, 139.
  Aghoris, 139.
  Avadhūtas, 139.
  Vāmāchārīs, 139.
  Sauras, 139.
  Gāṇapatyas, 139.
  Kartābhajā, 139.
Renaissance and Nationalist Movement, 318.
Representative Men, 469.

Review of Education, (1886), 55.
Rewa, 164.
Rice, 201.
Richardson, Capt. D.L., 40, 41.
Riots, (Bombay, 1837), 332.
Riots, (Calcutta, 1897), 334.
Ripon, Lord, 53, 64, 80, 250, 299, 369, 386, 411, 507, 508, 509, 535, 553, 562, 597, 598, 600.
Risbud, Naro Sadashiv, 187.
Rise and Growth of the Congress, 527.
Robert, Sir Frederick, 373.
Robinson, Sir Hercules, 619.
Rogay, Ali, 346.
Rohillas, 395.
Rohtak, 183.
Roman, (Script), 220, 221.
Rome, 268, 278.
Ronaldshay, Earl of, (Lord), 60, 365.
Round Table Conference, (1930-31), 234.
Routledge, 344.
Royal Commission, The, (1897), 613.
Royal Proclamation, (of 1858), 399, 400, 401, 402, 407, 455.
Roy, Raja Baidya-nath, 286.
Roy, Rājā Rāmmohan, 4, 5, 6, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 20, 22, 25, 32, 33, 34, 35, 44, 65, 92f, 93, 94, 95, 97f, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 110, 113, 130, 154, 167, 170, 177, 216, 224, 225, 226, 232, 233, 234, 235, 271, 272, 273, 274, 284, 306, 340, 343, 393, 418, 434, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 443, 447, 518, 521.
  Appeal to the King in Council, 4, 11, 12, 232.
  Appeal to the Christian Public, 12, 99.
  Tuhfat-ul-Muwahhidin, (A Gift to Monotheists), 97.
  The Precept of Jesus, 99.
  The Guide to Peace and Happiness, 99.
  Sambāda Kaumudi.
  Bengal Herald.
Ruies La Monte, Robert, 392.
Ruprām, Mahipatrām, 192.
Rurki, 139.
Russell, 68, 350.
Russia, 84, 131.
Ryan, E., 46.

Saadi, 20, 62.
Śabdamaṇidarpaṇa, 201.
Sadāsukhlāl, Munshi, 183.
Sādhanā, 117, 118, 122.
Sādhāran Brāhma Samāj, 596.
Sādhāram Dharma, 138.
Sādhāraṇī, 243, 249.
Sadruddīn, Mufti, 213.
Saharanpur, 76.
Sahabad, (District), 334.
Sahachar, 243.
Sahibram, Pandit, 165.
Śaiva Sabhās, 136.
Śaiva Siddhānta, 136.
Sakkari, Bālāchārya, (Śānti Kavi), 202.
Samāchāra-darpaṇa, see Marshman, J. C., 169, 171, 224, 439, 454.
Śakuntalā, 19.
Salisbury, Lord, 247, 324, 383, 384, 425, 554.
Samāchāra-Chandrikā, 100, 225, 245.
Samāchār Sudhāvarshan, 239.
Samāja-darpaṇa, 249.
Samaya, 252.
Sambādakaumudī, see Roy, Rājā Rām-Mohan, 38, 100, 170, 225f, 272.
Sambandar, 196.
Samiulla, Maulvi, 299, 300.
Sampson, George, 217.
San Antone Valley, 130.
Sanderson, 201.
San Francisco, 130.
Sāngatya, 202.
Sandhurst, 325.
Sanjīvanī, 597, 598.
Śaṅkarāchārya, 139.
  Vedānta Philosophy, 139.
Sanskrit College, (Banaras), 42, 74.
Sanskrit College, (Calcutta), 43, 68, 69, 277.
Santali, (Dialect), 221.
Sārābhāi, Bhoḷānāth, 192.
Śārada, (Script), 218, 219.
Sāradāmaṇi, 118, 119.
Sāradā Sadan, 266.
Saran, (District), 334.
Saraswati, Dayanand, 95, 107, 108, 110. *see Dayananda*, 111, 112, 113, 114, 137, 183.
  Founded Arya Samāj, 107.
  Satyartha P'rak'āś, 110.
  Veda-Bhāshya Bhūmikā, 110.
  Satyarth-Prakash, 114.
Sarkār, Akshay-Chandra, 177, 243.
Sarkar, Bihārī-lāl, 177.
Sarkar, Sir Jadu-nath, 1, 23.
Śarmā, Rādhāmohan, 165.
Śarmā, Rām, 217.
Śarmā, Vaidyanāth, 184.
Sarshār, Paṇḍit Ratann'āth, 215.
Sārvajanik Sabhā, (of Poona), 516, 517, 521, 522, 552.
Śāstrī, Ayyā, 202.
Śāstri, Bāpu, 185.
Śāstrī, Basavappa, (Abhinava Kālidāsa), 202.
Śāstri, Hara-prasād, 177.
Śāstrī, Moṭaganhaḷḷi Śaṁkara, 202.
Śāstrī, Pandit Śiva-nāth, 101, 105, 177, 473, 474, 597, 598.
Śāstrī, Pārvatīswara, 198.
Sāstri, Rāmasvāmi, 164.
  Kīrtivilāsa, 164.
  Bhaṭṭikāvya, 164.
  Kaivalyavallipariṇaya, 164.
  Prabodhachandrodaya, 164.
  Kshetratattvadīpikā, 164.
Śāstrī, Prof. Śēshagiri, 197.
Śāstrī, N. Subba, 202.
Śāstrī, Subrahmanya, 98.

Śāstrī, Sūryanārāyaṇa, 197, 198.
Śāstrī, Syāma, 203.
Śāstrī, Venkatarama, 199.
Śāstrī, Venkateśa, 202.
Sastri, Vishnu, 278.
Sati, (burning of a widow), 22, 100, 152, 224, 258, 263, 268f, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 277, 283, 387.
Satyagraha, 428.
Satyartha Prakasa, 475.
Satya-Shodak Samāj, 266.
Saugor, 513.
Savarkar, Vinayak Damodar, 592.
Sāyaṇa, 113.
Sayani, R.M., (Rahimatullah), 295, 315, 316, 318, 538, 571.
School Book Society, (1824), 287.
Scott, (Colonel), 3.
Scott, Sir Walter, 215.
Seeley, 4, 321.
Senāpati, Phakir-mohan, 179, 180.
Sen, Girish-chandra, 65.
Sen, Keshab-chandra, 93, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 109, 176, 177, 241, 246, 256, 375, 393, 468, 469, 473, 474, 482, 486, 545.
  Sangat Sabhā, 102.
  Brāhma Pratinidhi Sabhā, (Representative Assembly), 103.
  Brāhma Samāj of India, 103.
Sen, Kṛishṇa-prasanna, 115, 119.
Sen, Nabīn-chandra, 116, 172, 173, 245.
Sen, Narendra-nath, 241, 538.
Sen, Ram-kamal, 446.
Serampore, 33, 151, 162, 168, 184, 224, 225, 242, 269.
Serampore College, 68.
Serfogi, (Raja of Tanjore), 195.
Seriadji, Bezanj, 332.
Servants of India Society, 496, 497.
Shahabuddin, Kazi, 329.
Shah Alam, 13.
Shāh, Wājid 'Ali, 211.
Shāhjāhān, Emperor, 209, 405.
Shakespeare, 31, 68, 175, 192, 198.
Shams-ul-ulma, 315.
Shankershet, Jagannath, 265, 459.
Sharar, 'Abdul Hālim, 215.
Shashi, 599, 600.
Shaṭpadi, 202.
Sheikh Khodadin, 607, 608.
Sheikh Sukari, 607.
Shelley, 194.
Sherpore, 360.
Shia Arabic College, 147.
Shibsagar, 598, 606, 607.
Shifa'i, 212.
Shīfta, Nawab Mustafa Khān, 212.
Shitab Rai, 3.
Shore, John, (Lord Teignmouth), 42, 44, 223, 339.
Sialkotij, 366, 367, 369.
Siddhāntavijaya, 165.
Sikander, 268, 405.
Sikandar Jahan Begum, Nawab, 211.
Śikshādarpaṇa, 243.
Simkins, 362.
Sikandarnamah, 20.
Śilappadikāram, 196.
Siṁha-Kālī-prasanna, 177.
Simla, 322, 587.
Simla Conference, 60.
Sind, 210.
Sindhi, (Script), 220.
Singh, Gopal, 77.
Singh, Guru Govind, 313.
Singh, Jogendra, 217.
Singh, Maharaja Dalip, 275.
Singh, Raṇavīra, 165.
Singh, Ranjit, 140, 275, 482.
Sinhalese, (Script), 218.
Sañjībanī, 246.
Siraj-ud-daulah, 2, 3, 23, 277.
Sirhindi, Sheikh Ahmad, 140.
Śiromaṇi, Tāriṇī-charan, 169.
Sister Niveditā, 491.
Sītārāmāchārya, 198.
Sitaramayya, Pattabhi, 525, 526.
Śivachandra, 164.
Śiva Dayal, (Tulsī Rām), 138.
Śiva, Pranathārtihara, 198.
Sivāji, 199, 313, 330, 477, 495, 577, 579, 580, 581, 584, 589, 590.
Śivarāma, 165.
Śivaśaṅkara, 165.
Śrīnivāsa-dās, Lālā, 183.
Śrīperumbudūr, 165.
Śrīrāmamurti, Gurajāḍa, 200.
Śrīrāmulu, Dāsu, 198.
Smith, 346.
Smith, Lionel, (Major-General), K. C. B., 37.
Smith, Samuel, 390, 391.
Socrates, 584.
Somaprakāśa, 243, 248, 250.
Sorabji, Cornelia, 217.
South Africa, 420, 617, 623, 624.
Speer, T.G.P., 339, 344, 352, 377.
Spencer, Herbert, 123.
St. Joseph's College, (Negapatam), 74.
St. Paul's, 68.
St. Peter's College, (Tanjore), 74.
St. Stephen's College, (Delhi), 78.
St. Xavier's, (College), 72.
Stanhope, Leicester, 228, 279.
Statesman, The, 242.
Stephen, Fitzjames, 360.
Stevens, 606.
Stewart, Douglas, 40.
Strachey, Sir Arthur, I.C.S., 314.
Strachey, Sir Henry, 341.
Strachey, Sir John, 252, 321, 508.
Strassbourg, 374.
Strī-bodh, 292.
Strickland, Sir Walter, 372.
Students' Literary and Scientific Society, The, 186, 292.
Subhadrā, 166.
Subramaṇya, Venkaṭa Rāma Śāstrī, 201.
Subrahmaṇyakavi, 198.
Śuddhi, (Movement), 111, 268.

Sudhākar, 35, 183.
Suez Canal, 15.
Sūfī, 97, 118, 140, 142, 209, 213, 214.
Sujar-ul-Mutakherin, 9.
Sukumaran, K., 207.
Sulabha-Samāchāra, 246.
Sultan Al-Madāris, (Lucknow), 147.
Sultān-ul-Ākhbār, 239.
Sundararāja, 164.
Sundarar, 196.
Sundaravalli, 165.
Sunder Raman, Professor, 137, 531.
Suprabhāt, 65.
Surat, 191.
Surāṭ Samāchār, 191.
Surat Śabd Yoga, 138.
Surendranath, *see Banerji.*
Surūr, Rajab Ali, 147.
Śvāmī-Nārāyaṇa, 190, 191.
Svarṇa-kumārī, 175, 176.
Swadeshamitram, 248.
Swadeshi Movement, 478, 510, 567, 594.
Swāmigal, Rāmaliṅga, 196.
Syed-ul-Ākhbār, 225.
Sylhet, 606.

Tagore, Chandra Kumar, 233.
Tagore, Devendra-nath, 93, 101, 102, 103, 105, 107, 155, 177, 241, 450, 472, 540.
Tagore, Dwarakanath, 12, 13, 16, 101, 225, 233, 341, 342, 354, 393, 418, 441, 442, 443, 444, 446, 447, 448, 452, 454, 455, 518.
  Tattvabodhinī, 101.
Tagore, Dwijendra-nath, 65, 173f, 176.
Tagore, Jñānendra-mohan, 520.
Tagore, Sir Jatindra-mohan, 334, 534.
Tagore, Jyotirindra-nath, 175.
Tagore, Prasanna-kumar, 13, 175, 233, 418, 440, 442, 443, 452.
Tagore, Rabindra-nath, 28, 162, 170, 173, 175, 176, 393, 472, 487, 593.
Tagore, Rama-nath, 260, 446.
Tahzib al-Akhlaq, see Khan, Sir Syed Ahmad, 144f.
Tāhzīb-i-Niswān, 148.
Taimiya, Ibn, 142f.
Taj Mahal, 405.
Talukdars, 63, 74, 78.
Tālyārkhan, Jehāngir Ardeshir, 192.
Tamayya, Rangadāsa Śrīnivāsa, 201.
Tampurān, Kochchuṇṇi, 165.
Tampurān, Kuññikkuṭṭan, 165.
Taṅkārā, 108.
Tanjore, 72, 163, 199.
Tarakvāchaspati, Tārānāth, 165.
Tarka-chūḍāmaṇi, Pandit Śaśadhar, 115.
Tarkālaṅkār, Jayagopal, 169.
Tarakaratna, Panchānan, 166.
Tarkaratna, Rāmnārāyan, 175.
Tarkhadkar, Bhaskar Pandurang, 456, 476.
Tarkhadkar, Dādoba Paṇḍurang, (Pāṇini of Marāṭhī), 185.
Tattvabodhini Patrika, 155, 176.
Tattva-bodhinī Sabhā, 277.
Taw Sein Ko, 366.
Tehsildari, (Schools), 75, 77.
Tejpur, 513, 598, 599.
Telang, Kashinath Trimbak, 515, 516, 527, 533, 538.
Telugu-Kannada, (Script), 218, 220.
Temple, Richard, 77, 515.
Temps, 564.
Thakoor, Hurree Mohan, 28.
Thakor, Balvantrai Kalyaṇrāi, 194.
Thākur, 592.
Thampi, Irayimman, 203.
  Omaṇa Ttiṅkaḷkitāvō, 203.
  Dakshayāgam, 203.
  Kīchakavadhyam, 203.
  Uttarā-svayamvaram, 203.
Thampinan, Appan, 207.
Tampurān, Keralavarma Valiya Koil, 164.
Thampuran, Kochunni, 206.
Thampuran, Kunju Kuttan, 206.
Thana, 70, 72, 332.
Thāyumānavar, 195, 196.
Theosophical Society, *see Blavatsky*, 131-134, 476, 491, 492, 526.
Theosophical Convention, (1884), 525.
Thirunal, Ayilliyam, 204.
Thirunal, Swathi, 202, 203.
Thirunal, Uthram, 203.
Thiruvilayādal Purānam, 196.
Thomas, H.H., 322.
Thomason, 63, 74, 76.
Thompson, 353, 448.
Thompson, George, 389, 393, 394, 408.
Thornton, Henry, 42, 235, 237.
Thyāgarāja, 203.
Tibet, 97, 133.
Tibetan War, 253.
Tilak, B. G., (Bal Gangadhar-Lokamanya), 186, 189, 245, 250, 260, 266, 283, 284, 430, 476, 477, 487, 522, 571, 576, 577, 578, 579, 580, 581, 582, 583, 584, 585, 586, 589, 592.
  Késarī, 186.
Tilak, Rev. N.V., 189.
Times, The, 222.
Times of India, The, 225, 242, 350.
Times, London, 398, 455, 538, 539, 551, 552, 553.
Tipu Sultan, 14, 268, 432.
Tirunal, Visakham, 204.
Tīrthaswāmi, Hariharānanda, 98.
Tols, 8, 17.
Totā-purī, 117, 118.
Town Hall, Calcutta, 434, 438, 442, 455, 504, 505, 614.
Trailaṅga Svāmī, 139.
Tranquebar, 150.
Transvaal, 617, 618, 619, 620, 622, 623, 624.
Transvaal British Association, 620.
Travancore, 163, 164, 202, 267.
Travancore Planter's Case, 371.

Trevelyan, Sir Charles, 37, 45, 46, 48, 62, 238, 383, 386, 507.
Tribune, (Lahore), 243.
Trichinopoly, 72.
Trilokekar, Sókar Bāpuji, 188.
Trinidad, 613.
Tripāthī, Govardhanrām Mādhavarām, 192, 193, 195.
  Sarasvatīchandr, 192, 193, 194.
  Sākshārjīvan, 193.
  Navaljīvan, 193.
  Līlāvatījīvankalā, 193.
Tripāthī, Govardhanrām Mādhavarām, 192, 193, 195.
Triveṇī, 165.
"Tufta", Munshi Hargopāl, 213.
Tukārām, 184.
Tuljāshankar, Nandshankar, 192.
Turton, 447.
Tuticorin, 299.
Twining, 151.
Tyabji, Abbas S., 317.
Tyabji, Badruddin, 315, 331, 515, 516, 533, 542.
Tyabji, Mr. Justice, 317.
Tyabji, Sir Syed, 314, 315.
Tyson, 613.
Tytler, 68.
Tattvabodhinī Patrikā, 102, 176.
Tezpur, *see Tejpur.*

Udaipur, 175.
Udbodhana, 129.
Udayrām, Raṇchhoḍbhāi, 192, 195.
Ulloor, 207.
Umballa, *see Ambala.*
Uncle Tom's Cabin, 596.
United Indian Patriotic Association, (Aligarh), 312, 316, 317, 546.
University of Lahore, 53.
Universities Act, (1904), 60, 560.
University of Allahabad, 53.
Universities Commission, 57.
Upādhyāy, Ayodhyā Singh, ('Hari Audh'), 183.
Upanishads, 99, 100, 102, 112, 164.
Urfi, 20, 212.
Utkaḷa-Darpaṇa, 180.
Utkala-dīpikā, 180.
Utkaḷa-Hitaishiṇī, 180.
Utkaḷa-prabhā, The, 181.
Utkaḷa-Putra, 180.
Utkaḷa-Sāhitya, The, 181.
University Board, (Madras), 73.
University, (Bombay), 51, 52, 187, 190, 194.
University, (Calcutta), 49, 51, 52, 53, 57, 59, 69, 76, 78, 123, 298, 529, 530.
University, (Madras), 51, 52, 73f, 204, 205.
University College, (Lahore), 53.
University, (Allahabad), 76, 298.
University, (Punjab), 53, 78.
Vaidya, C.V., 188.
Vaidya, Gajananrao, 265.
Vaidyanāth, 119.
Vāglela, Viśvanāth Siṁha, 164.
Vairāgī, 285.
Valiakoithampuran, Kerala Varma, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208.
Vallathol, 207.
Vāñchcheśvara, 164.
Vaqār'ul-Mulk, 144.
Vārānasi, *see Banaras.*
Varier, Unnai, 203.
Varma, A.R. Rāja Rāja, 206, 207, 208.
Varma, Pandalam Kerala, 207.
Varma, Rāma, 164.
Varma, Vīrakerala, 164.
Varman, Rājarāja, 165.
Vāsudeva, 165.
Vasurāyalu, 198.
Vartamāndīpikā, 186.
Varuṇa, 113.
Vedānta College, 98.
Veeresalingam, 278.
Veṅgamena, Tarigoṇḍa, 199.
Venkaṭāchārya, B., 202.
Venkaṭarāju, Pōḍuri, 199.
Venkaṭarāyakavi, Sīrnāḍu, 199.
Vernacular Press Act, 244, 247, (IX of 1878), 248, 250, 429, 503, 504, 554, 592.
Vichāralaharī, 186.
Victoria Paper, The, 317.
Vidhināṭaka, 199.
Victoria, Queen, 306, 381, 393, 420, 455, 518.
Vidyālaṅkār, Mṛityuñjay, 167, 168, 465.
Vidyābāgīsh, Pandit Rām-chandra, 101.
Vidyābinod, Kshīrod-prasād, 176.
Vidyabhusan, Dwaraka-nath, 243f.
Vidyābhūshaṇ, Jogendra-nāth, 177, 243.
Vidy'ālaṅkār, Haṭī, 288.
Vidyalankar, Pandit Gaurmohan, 287.
Vidyāratna, Pandit Ram-kumar, 596, 597.
Vidyāsāgar, Pandit Īśvar-chandra, 66, 170, 173, 176, 177, 260, 263, 277, 278, 292.
Vijayakar, Marobā Kanhobā, 187.
Viraraghavacharya, 248.
Vīreśaliṅgam, Rao Bahadur K., 198, 199, 200.
Viśākham Tirunāl, 164.
Vishṇupriyā, 285.
Viśveśvara, 165.
Vithoba, 332.
Vivekānanda, Svāmī, 95, 117, 119, 120, 121, 123-131, 176, 474, 476, 488, 489, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494, 495, 586.
  Rāmakṛishṇa Order, 126, 130.
  Rāmakṛishṇa Mission, 129, 130.
  Rāmakṛishṇa Mission, House of Service, 130.
  Paper on Hinduism, 127.
  My Master, 129.
  Rājayoga, 129.
  Karmayoga, 129.

  Bhaktiyoga, 129.
Vividhārtha Saṅgraha, see *Mitra, Rājendra-lāl,* 176.
Vizagapatam, 165.
Vizier of Oudh, 14.
Volksraad, 619.
Voltaire, 39.
Vrindāban, 118.
Vyādh, 285.
Vyāpti-Pañchaka, 19.
Vyasa, 113.
Veda Samāj, (*see Brāhma Samāj*).
Varanasi, *see Banaras.*

Wacha, D.E., 540.
Wahabi, (Movement), 5, 134, 142f, 145, 297, 305, 306, 319, 327, 328, 431, 476.
Walker, 276.
Wallace, William, 582.
Wali'ullah, Shāh, 209.
Ward, William, 25, 61, 62, 151, 242, 285.
Warden, 71.
Waring, Major Scott, 42.
Wazirabad, 252.
Wedderburn, William, 396, 518, 535, 547, 553, 562, 563.
Weekly Journal, 226.
Weekly Madras Gazette, 223.
Wellesley, 229.
  Regulations for the Press, (1799), 229.
Wellesley, Lord, 151, 270.
Wellington, Duke of, 322.
Whipping Act, (1864), 350.
White, 521.
Widow Remarriage Association, 278.
Widows' Home, 278.
Wiegle, 201.
Wilberforce, 152.
Wilberforce, William, 42.
Williamson, Capt., 339.
Williams, Monier, 215.
Wilson College, 70, 71, 72.
Wilson, Mrs., *see Miss Cooke*, 69, 72, 286.
Winslow, 197.
Witwatersrand, 622.
Wodeyar, Chāma Rāja, 202.
Wood, Sir Charles, 49, 50, 389, 455.
  Educational Despatch, (1854), 49, 50, 51, 52, 55, 63, 64, 66, 68, 292.
Woodburn, Sir John, 362, 363.
Woodrow, Henry, 69, 74.
Wordsworth, 194.
Wilson, H.H., 273, 286, 386, 466.

Yakshagāna, 199, 201.
Yati, Advaitendra, 164.
Yavana-Jāti, 7.
Yayāti, 175.
Yemen, 210.
Yōgi, Rāma Brahmānanda, 201.
Yokohama, 129.
Young Italy, 481, 483, 593.
Young Turk Movement, 306.
Yule, George, 546.
Yusuf, Muhammad, 302.
Yusuf and Zulekha, 20.
Yuvarāja, Goda Varma, 165.
  Rasasadana Bhāṇa, 165.
  Rāmacharita, 165.

Zabid, 210.
Zafar, Bahādur Shāh, 141.
Zain-ul-'Ābidīn, 268.
Zaka'ullah, Maulavi, 147f, 215.
Zanq, Muhammad Ibrāhim, 214, 215.
Zeigenbalg, 150.
Zeigler, 201.
Zemindary Association, 446.
Zia-ud-din, Shamsul-Ulma Maulavi 145.
Zubda, (Permutation), 20.
Zuhair, Ka'b bin, 209.

THE HISTORY AND CULTURE OF THE INDIAN PEOPLE

This is the first history of India, written exclusively by her own people, bringing to bear on the problems a detached and truly critical appreciation. A team of over sixty scholars of repute presents herein a comprehensive and up-to-date account of the political, socio-economic and cultural history of the Indian people.

VOLUME I
THE VEDIC AGE
(up to 600 B.C.)

VOLUME II
THE AGE OF IMPERIAL UNITY
(600 B.C. to 320 A.D.)

VOLUME III
THE CLASSICAL AGE
(320-750 A.D.)

VOLUME IV
THE AGE OF IMPERIAL KANAUJ
(750-1000 A.D.)

VOLUME V
THE STRUGGLE FOR EMPIRE
(1000-1300 A.D.)

VOLUME VI
THE DELHI SULTANATE
(1300-1526 A.D.)

VOLUME VII
THE MUGHAL EMPIRE
(1526-1707 A.D.)

VOLUME VIII
THE MARATHA SUPREMACY
(1707-1818 A.D.)

VOLUME IX
BRITISH PARAMOUNTCY AND INDIAN RENAISSANCE (1818-1905 A.D.) PART I

VOLUME X
BRITISH PARAMOUNTCY AND INDIAN RENAISSANCE (1818-1905 A.D.) PART II

VOLUME XI
STRUGGLE FOR FREEDOM (1905-1947)

VOLUME I : THE VEDIC AGE

"This history unlike its predecessors is first and foremost a history of India and of her people rather than a history of those who have from time to time invaded her.... The standard, in a word, is very high...."

The Times Literary Supplement, London

"....Distinguished historians contribute and they are not only learned but also very readable .... It contains much new information...."

The Manchester Guardian, Manchester

VOLUME II : THE AGE OF IMPERIAL UNITY

"....It is safe to say that these volumes will transform the study of Indian history in our times; their authors are not only writing history, they themselves are making history, a whole new history of knowledge and education...."

The Illustrated Weekly of India, Bombay

VOLUME III : THE CLASSICAL AGE

"....It maintains the leading trait of the series viz. to devote more attention to the social and cultural aspects of the story than to the purely political side, and the narrative of dynastic struggles and wars.... The political history is generally complete and up-to-date and a great amount of authentic information on social and economic history has been culled and presented systematically for the first time...."

K. A. Nilakanta Sastri in *Journal of Indian History*

VOLUME IV : THE AGE OF IMPERIAL KANAUJ

"....This is a magnificent piece of exact and unbiased scholarship.... Its pages are alive with the spirit of the modern Indian Renaissance; freedom has animated Indian learning and this is one of its finest achievements....this new Indian history is not concerned merely, or even mainly, with war and politics. Two thirds of the book deal with cultural and social matters...."

The Statesman, Calcutta

VOLUME V : THE STRUGGLE FOR EMPIRE

"....Like all the preceding volumes its treatment.... is detailed and comprehensive and is based upon the highest standards of scholarship. The contributors .... have made the best use of all the available source material and the important previous works on the subject....From every point of view it will be accepted as the standard and authoritative work on the history of India in the age of transition from ancient to medieval times...."

The Hindustan Times, New Delhi

VOLUME VI : THE DELHI SULTANATE

"....Voluminous publication....piecing together all relevant material....easily stands out as one of the most outstanding and comprehensive treatises so far brought out on this period of Indian history....surpasses them all....being written....from an entirely new angle of vision....is indeed a significant contribution....this comprehensive and detailed work is really a very valuable addition to the existing literature on the subject...."

The Pioneer, Lucknow

VOLUME VII : THE MUGHUL EMPIRE

"....A comprehensive and balanced history of a momentous period; an exacting task ably fulfilled....A notable volume in a notable series, the work is a finely integrated and well brought-out history of a remarkable time...."

Nagpur Times, Nagpur

VOLUME VIII : THE MARATHA SUPREMACY

"....The editors have done a commendable job in bringing out this volume in which the political history of the period has been dealt with in a scholarly manner...."

The National Herald, New Delhi

VOLUME IX : BRITISH PARAMOUNTCY AND INDIAN RENAISSANCE, PART I

"....The volume is an exhaustive study of the British rule....Its impact on the cultural, social and educational life in the country....This is an important publication for students of Indian history...."

The Hitavada, Nagpur

VOLUME X : BRITISH PARAMOUNTCY AND INDIAN RENAISSANCE, PART II

"....This volume, like its predecessors, is a mine of information and brings to light numerous significant facts and developments in the last century....It maintains the high standards set by the earlier volumes...."

Sunday Standard, Bombay

VOLUME XI : STRUGGLE FOR FREEDOM

"....The present volume covers the momentous period 1905-1947. It gives a detailed account not only of political developments, but also of such other essential topics as administration, education, art and literature...."

"Unique in the annals of modern Indian scholarship...."

Sunday Standard, Bombay

ISBN 81-7276-407-1